



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO
PRIVATE ROOM

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

OCTOBER 1965

LETTER OF FATHER GENERAL ON EDUCATION

STUDENT PERSONNEL

ACADEMIC DEANS

JESUIT PRIEST AND SCHOLAR

THE BLIND STUDENT

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

Vol. XXVIII, No. 2

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION)

Our Contributors

VERY REVEREND FATHER GENERAL: The JEQ takes pride in printing one of the first letters of Father Arrupe on the subject of education and the Society.

FATHER GORDON HENDERSON (Maryland Province) is Director of Student Personnel at Wheeling College and was Director of the Student Personnel Workshop at Denver in August 1965.

FATHER J. BARRY MC GANNON (Missouri Province) is Dean of Arts and Sciences at St. Louis University. Father took a prominent part in the Loyola Workshop on Philosophy and Theology and is co-editor of the Volume **CHRISTIAN FORMATION AND WISDOM**.

FATHER PAUL M. QUAY (Chicago Province) is currently in the Department of Physics at Loyola University, Chicago. The holder of a Doctorate in Physics from M.I.T., Father has just finished a post-doctoral year in Europe in research.

MR. EDWARD T. RUCH is the lay director of Educational Services for the Blind at the Xavier Society for the Blind. Mr. Ruch has special competency in this area since he himself is non-sighted.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

October, 1965

CONTENTS

REVEREND FATHER GENERAL TO THE FATHERS OF THE FRENCH SCHOOLS.....	69
THE 1965 DENVER WORKSHOP ON STUDENT PERSONNEL <i>G. Gordon Henderson, S.J.</i>	75
LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR A CHANGING WORLD: INTEGRATION AND THE CURRICULUM <i>J. Barry Mc Gannon, S.J.</i>	80
JESUIT, PRIEST, AND SCHOLAR <i>Paul M. Quay, S.J.</i>	98
A BLIND STUDENT— WHY NOT? <i>Edward T. Ruch</i>	122
NEWS FROM THE FIELD	132

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

Edward B. Rooney, S.J.

Assistant Editor

Paul A. FitzGerald, S.J.

Managing Editor

Eugene F. Mangold, S.J.

Advisory Board

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

Joseph T. Browne, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
James L. Burke, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
Cornelius J. Carr, S.J.	<i>Buffalo Province</i>
Bernard J. Dooley, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
Joseph K. Drane, S.J.	<i>Maryland Province</i>
James E. FitzGerald, S.J.	<i>New England Province</i>
Herman J. Hauck, S.J.	<i>California Province</i>
Adrian J. Kochanski, S.J.	<i>Wisconsin Province</i>
John V. Murphy, S.J.	<i>Oregon Province</i>
Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J.	<i>New York Province</i>
William D. Ryan, S.J.	<i>Missouri Province</i>
Paul V. Siegfried, S.J.	<i>Detroit Province</i>
John F. Sullivan, S.J.	<i>Chicago Province</i>
James F. Whelan, S.J.	<i>New Orleans Province</i>

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028

COPYRIGHT, 1966

JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY

Reverend Father General to the Fathers of the French Schools^{1*}

Rome
25 August 1965

Reverend and dear Fathers:

You are about to hold an important meeting at Amiens which will be devoted to the crucial apostolate of education in the modern world, a world now in the process of complete transformation. I would like very much to be with you during these days of reflection and discussion. But such a trip, as you will understand, is out of the question at this time when I must concentrate my energies on a variety of tasks and, in particular, must prepare myself for the next session of the Council. May this letter be a pledge to you, at the very least, of the interest that I manifest toward your work and the profound desire that I have to associate myself with it in a personal way.

Permit me, first of all, to thank you for the remarkable work that you are doing in France, through your schools, of which I have already received so much evidence. This expression of my gratitude is not a routine "*captatio benevolentiae*," and I would hope that you can sense its deep sincerity. I emphasize this point especially because a success such as yours presupposes, in addition to competence, a great spirit of sacrifice, especially in our times when, in your schools, you have to carry on an enterprise which remains hidden, humble, often questioned and poorly understood.

I need not delay long on the importance of your task; you can evaluate it much better than I. You are forming men of whom it is certain a good number will leave their mark on their times and will become eminent servants of the Church. From your schools will also go forth, as both you and I hope, priests whose light will shine throughout the world and, among them, Jesuits who will one day take your place in the work of education.

Certainly, one hears raised today, as I already hinted, many objections against the work that we are doing in the schools.

1. A letter written on the occasion of a meeting of Jesuit educational administrators and teachers at Amiens, France, August 30 to September 2, 1965.

* Translated from the French by Reverend Paul A. FitzGerald, S.J., Assistant for Higher Education, Jesuit Educational Association.

They say, for example, that the Fathers are not accomplishing here a work that is truly and fully sacerdotal. You know from experience that nothing is further from the truth. Your priesthood, if it permeates your entire life and if it catches up all human values and unites them with the redemptive act of Jesus Christ, can and ought to deepen and strengthen itself precisely through your work as the educators of young Christians. They say that other apostolic ministries are today more efficacious. I cannot believe it, for nothing is more useful to contemporary society than to prepare for it men of solid character and personality whom that same society now so critically needs. They also allege that our schools are too exclusive and reserved for the wealthy. It is possible that this observation may be partially correct, in which case it is up to us to discover concrete solutions which will open our schools to the poor, and even to the very poor. I know, moreover, that you have already made considerable progress in this direction, and I can only ask that you increase your efforts even more, in order that the schools to which you give direction and inspiration may be able to accept in larger numbers all those who are capable of profiting from a solid formation, even though they are without any resources. They say, furthermore, that we attach too much importance to the training of the intellect, as if success in examinations were our only concern. Your whole pedagogical objective gives the lie to such an assertion; we cannot, in fact, be faithful to our apostolic ideal unless we work for the integral formation of those youths who are entrusted to us, ensuring the steadfastness of their character, the rectitude of their judgment and their emotions, their esthetic sense, their community and social awareness etc.

I have just recalled, designedly, some of the objections which I hear raised à propos of our ministry of education. It was especially to tell you to what degree these objections seem to me to be without serious foundation, or without any foundation. Certainly this is not the hour for us to relax the effort that we expend in this ministry, which I consider so important, but rather to make our schools ever more adapted to a world which is being constructed and put together under our very eyes. In order that this adaptation may be more exact, allow me to share with you, with all the simplicity that I could put into a direct conversation, some of the ideas which are particularly dear to me.

First of all, a school that wants to be faithful to the mind of

St. Ignatius must play, in the area where it is located, a decisive role. It ought to play this role with boldness and with great confidence, facing frankly the problems of the times and ready for all innovations, even the most radical, so as to lose nothing of its apostolic effectiveness. I see two conditions to implement this objective.

The first is that the school should be "open." Open, first of all to the changes in the Church and its quest, in such fashion that the Fathers may be unceasingly attentive to transmit in their teaching and in their methods of education everything that will allow their students to assimilate, in all its vigor, the vitality of a Church in change. Open in the next place, without any fear, to the psychological, cultural and social transformations which are being brought about today at an accelerated pace, following the example itself of Saint Ignatius who studied the methods of the great universities and centers of education of his times and smoothly incorporated them into the first schools of the Society. This cannot fail to raise many questions, for it is quite clear that we must know how to distinguish the constructive elements from those that are not. But our role as educators prevents us from being satisfied with methods that were considered excellent in former times; quite the contrary, our role forces us to adjust ourselves to the actual evolution of academic and educational structures, and to be constantly searching in order to show ourselves, prudently but realistically, faithful to the mentality of our generation, even if we must put aside some of our cherished convictions.

The second condition for the effectiveness of a school is its educational value. I am really saying that the standard of the total formation, and in particular that of the academic aspect, ought to be such that the students find themselves constantly stimulated toward a higher ideal and toward a more serious approach to their work, thus making themselves capable of being numbered among the most competent and influential men of their generation. It must be said and said again, that we must tolerate in our schools neither mediocrity in studies nor an inferior education for, in that case, the apostolic value itself of the enterprise would be diminished or even completely nullified.

Let these considerations guide us in the choice of our professors, both Jesuit and lay, and in their scientific training; in the recruitment of our students, who ought always to be capable of this

superior formation that I have just described; and, lastly, in the evaluation of our methods and pedagogical practices. I am confident that you will discover concrete and appropriate solutions for the fulfillment of these lofty expectations.

Once these fundamental conditions have been clearly established I would like to insist on three points that are particularly relevant.

In the first place, the Fathers who labor in a school offer a striking witness of their ideal Jesuit, not only by the apostolate which they exercise in behalf of their students, in instructing them, in forming their personality, in living before them in a completely accessible fashion; but also by spreading their influence beyond this cultural and collegiate center in a given city or region. You are aware that such was one of the goals of Saint Ignatius, which ever afterwards never ceased to be clearly endorsed by every generation of the Society. Instruction given in a school ought to be like a hearth, emanating from which the professors and instructors exercise their influence by their various works, in literature, history, philosophy, science etc. Today more than ever, in a world which has shorn itself of Christian and often human values, it seems to me that our schools ought to organize this vast cultural radiance in behalf of the elite and of the masses, thus playing a decisive role in confronting theoretic and practical atheism which is winning so many modern adherents. I fervently wish that each Father might thus realize in all its fulness his vocation as an apostle in his school, and beyond his school. There would be, moreover, a new dimension in his task as an educator, because he would be more aware of the conditions in which the life and the thought of our contemporaries are developed.

In the second place, we ought to strive in every way possible (I mentioned this to you a moment ago) that the formation which we give to our students may be as adapted as possible to the world in which, a little later on, they will have to carry on their activity as adults. Let us imbue them with a truly Catholic spirit, a spirit which prevails over national boundaries and uncovers to them the needs of countries less developed than theirs. Let us help them to understand the aspirations which are today forcing themselves to the surface as part of the current cultural evolution, instructing them in a timely way to discern true values. Let us utilize in their behalf the modern techniques of education and communication. As the Society, for example, in times past

knew how to incorporate into its pedagogy oratory or the theatre, let us consider that today the radio, the cinema, television, the press etc. can contribute greatly to the education of children and young people. These techniques, moreover, will be very serviceable to them later on as daily aids in their professional work and in their social life. On this point, perhaps, we have to say "mea culpa," in asking ourselves if we are behind the times in the current evolution of the world. In any event, let these reflections persuade us to be very select in the choice of our students, in order to admit into our schools only those who are more suitable to profit by such an education and to derive from it certain benefits, whatever may be in other respects their social origin.

There is a third point which seems to me to be of great importance today; that is, our collaboration with laymen. I know that your schools in France have made great progress along these lines, but I would like to encourage you to do even more, in so far as you can. Many of our lay professors are very glad to share our apostolic life, in giving themselves to the service of our students and, in a spirit of sacrifice, to the Church. Let us encourage them to assume in our schools responsibilities of greater importance and, for this reason, let us not hesitate to surrender for ourselves certain offices which come within the competence of our lay colleagues. With complete openness and with a great respect for their own vocation, let us put at their disposal all that the Society possesses that is best in its spiritual and pedagogical traditions, in its adaptation to the world of today, in its fidelity to the Church. In this way we will afford them the opportunity to be, according to the firm directives of the Ecumenical Council, true apostles in union with our own apostolate.

I would like, finally, since your meeting is an important occasion, to say to you how indispensable appears to me the effort you have undertaken in order to know better the sociological milieu of your students. The conclusions of such inquiries can and ought to be very valuable for a better use of pedagogical methods, for a more enlightened orientation of the students, for a more efficacious apostolate toward their families and finally for a more exact appreciation of the mentality and environment in which it will be necessary for you to live in complete approachability. If, after you have discussed these issues during the course of your meeting, you can, in each school, follow up with a precise analysis of the milieu to which you address yourselves, of its reactions, of its

needs, I think that you will have made a very useful contribution for the future orientation of your schools in France and even for those of other countries.

I would still have, reverend and dear Fathers, many things to say to you, if I were able to devote more time to a longer conversation with you. May these reflections make you at least understand the great importance that I attach to the work that you are pursuing. Give to your students a great ideal. Know how, with discretion but with firmness and clarity, to speak to them of Jesus Christ and to lead them progressively forward so that their life may be a true expression of His life in the Church. May you yourselves be men fully bound to God, in prayer and in the sacrifice that you have to renew each day by the humble service which is demanded of you. Strengthen among yourselves, from school to school and from the midst of each community, the bonds of active cooperation, in such fashion that each one feels himself part of a common enterprise in the work of education demanded of all. It is thus that you will preserve an enthusiastic confidence in your work and that you will communicate this confidence to others which will enable them to accomplish great deeds for the Kingdom of God.

If your meeting suggests certain considerations which you feel would be helpful either to myself or to the General Congregation, you may submit them to the Father Assistant of France, who will preside at your meeting, or address them directly to me. I will express my gratitude in advance.

In wishing you, reverend and dear Fathers, you and all the priests, brothers and laymen who are collaborating with you at this meeting, profitable sessions, I assure you of my promise to pray for you and from my heart I bestow upon you my paternal benediction.

Your servant in Christ,

Peter Arrupe, S.J.
Superior General of the Society of Jesus

The 1965 Denver Workshop on Student Personnel

G. Gordon Henderson, S.J.*

Last summer a Jesuit Educational Association Workshop for Jesuit Student Personnel Services and Programs was held at Regis College, Denver, Colorado, July 18th to 30th. This Workshop, the culmination of almost two years of preparatory work, was the first national meeting of Jesuit student personnel workers to have representatives of every student personnel service present. The participants were college presidents, province directors of higher education, deans of students, deans of men, deans of women, psychologists engaged in guidance and counseling services, academic deans, college chaplains, and a group of experts on various phases of student personnel work. Most of these latter were from Jesuit institutions with a few outstanding experts from other American institutions.

I think that it can honestly be said that the Workshop was a tremendous experience in cooperative effort by all college personnel workers which proved in the concrete order what great progress can be made with the joint efforts of all engaged in student services. The enthusiasm and hard work of the participants was striking and while, to be sure, solutions to all problems encountered in setting up a complete, coordinated personnel program were by no means arrived at, none the less a very excellent beginning was made.

For some time preceding last summer's Workshop recommendations for a study of our student personnel services had come from many sources. A final and strong impetus for planning a Workshop, however, came from the 1962 Workshop held in Los Angeles. In the final report of that Workshop there was the following recommendation:

Over and over again, in papers, from the floor, in team and in individual reports, and in informal discussions, participants express dissatisfaction with the organizational relationships among the religious activities — sodalities, counseling, etc., and between them and other activities and the

* Father Henderson was Director of the Workshop.

administration. There seems to be almost a universal feeling that good organizational patterns were lacking and that clear definitions were likewise lacking for such positions as chaplain, spiritual counselor, etc. This insistent discussion indicated that *this whole problem needs study and clarification*.¹

Two things emerged from the discussions at Los Angeles regarding the personnel program: student personnel workers frequently lacked professional training and the student personnel program as a whole seemed to lack coordination. A third point was also made, no doubt closely related to the first two: The student personnel program did not seem to be integrated with the total educational institution. Taking its cue from the Los Angeles Workshop, the Planning Committee of the Denver Workshop set as its theme: "Coordination of the student personnel program and its integration with the total educational purpose of the Jesuit institution of higher education."

The task of the Workshop then was to study the complete Jesuit student personnel program and attempt to plan a program which would be complete and coordinated as well as integrated with the total educational program of the College. The Workshop, therefore, undertook the task of delineating the various functions which the various student personnel services were to fill and to describe in some detail the various offices needed in an optimal program. After careful study the Workshop proposed minimum norms for the professional training of personnel administrators.

Since it was felt necessary that every area of student services should be evaluated, and since, as a matter of practical fact, the Workshop could not last more than two weeks, a considerable amount of work was done in advance. Special background papers were prepared on a variety of topics and a reading list was given to the prospective participants. It was hoped that as a result of reading the background papers, together with several works on student personnel services, all participants, no matter how specialized the work in which they were engaged, would come to the Workshop with a common, general background which would make it possible to discuss other specialized areas of student services with intelligent understanding.

1. Robert J. Henle, S.J. (ed.), *Final Report of the Workshop on the Role of Philosophy and Theology as Academic Disciplines and Their Integration with the Moral, Religious and Spiritual Life of the Jesuit College Student* (New York: Jesuit Educational Association), Vol. V, pp. 437, 438.

The Program itself was divided into three parts. A session of three days followed by a break day, a session of four days followed by a break day, and a final three day session. The first session directed itself to a consideration of basic principles. The second session concerned itself with the student personnel program with a special focus on the student it was designed to serve, and the third and final session concerned itself with specific proposals which would insure a coordinated and integrated student personnel program.

To insure that the time of the meetings could be devoted actually to working on a blueprint for student personnel services, the presentation papers were not read at the Workshop but rather copies of these were provided the participants before the Workshop. The author of each presentation paper gave a brief summary of his paper at the Workshop and plunged immediately into discussion of the topic. After this general discussion session, the members of the Workshop were assigned to small groups for further discussion of the topic. Reports were sent in from these small group discussions to a Task Force whose job it was to write up a specific area of student personnel services and indicate ways in which this specific service could be most efficiently directed, how it could be coordinated with other student services, and in what way it should be integrated with the total educational enterprise of the Institution. The Task Forces were to be the vehicle whereby the thinking of the Workshop could be crystalized. By means of this vehicle, specific suggestions were made in terms of the description of student services, descriptions of responsibilities for each student service, as well as methods of coordination and integration.

The participants of the Workshop were extremely fortunate to have had present with them a number of national experts in the field of student personnel services. Dean E. G. Williamson, for many years the distinguished Dean of Students at the University of Minnesota and author of many articles and books on the topic of student personnel services, was present for the entire Workshop. Dean Williamson presented a background paper for the study of the members of the Workshop and also a very enlightening presentation paper which began the Workshop. It would be impossible to evaluate the tremendous contribution Dean Williamson made to the Workshop. He attended general discussions, small group discussions, served as a member of one important Task Force and

as a consultant to many of the other Task Forces. In every way by his kindness, his interest and his expert knowledge, he advanced the work of the Workshop.

During the second session, which focused upon the student, the Workshop was fortunate to have in residence Dr. Dana L. Farnsworth, Henry K. Oliver Professor of Hygiene and Director of Student Health Services at Harvard University. Dr. Farnsworth also provided background material as well as presentation papers for the Workshop concerning the characteristics and problems of the college student. Dr. Farnsworth's discussions were among the highlights of the Workshop.

Dr. Philip Tripp of the U.S. Office of Education also attended the Workshop for a number of days. His experience and research in the field of student personnel services made it possible for him to give many practical suggestions which kept discussions in the real order. He presented the results of research studies which gave us a clear description of the present status of the professional student personnel worker in the national scene.

The last days of the Workshop were devoted to the presentation and discussion in full session of the reports of the various Task Forces. It is from these Task Force reports that we will get the conclusions and the proposals of the Workshop. It would be premature, before the publication of the *Proceedings*, to attempt to give in any great detail the conclusions reached.

In general, however, it can be reported that the Workshop found itself in full agreement with the Los Angeles Workshop in the urgent need for coordination and integration of student personnel services. Participants of the Workshop, too, felt that the professional training of student personnel workers in our institutions frequently left much to be desired. To improve the situation, the Workshop recommended specific professional training for each student personnel worker. To obtain greater coordination in all areas of student services, the Workshop recommended that the total student personnel program in an institution be unified under one official who, under the President, would be responsible for the total student personnel program. The Workshop specifically recommended that this program not be administered by the academic dean of the college, nor by any department of instruction.

Task Force reports then went on to describe the responsibilities of the various student personnel areas, including a specific descrip-

tion of the important student personnel offices, namely, the dean of students, dean of men, dean of women, college chaplain, director of guidance and counseling services, director of housing, etc. It is hoped that the *Proceedings*, which will be published within the next month or so, will give a much clearer and more detailed picture of the conclusions and recommendations of the Workshop.

With increased enrollment in most of our institutions, together with increased restlessness on the part of our students, there is perhaps no aspect of the higher educational enterprise which deserves more attention at this time than student personnel services. If they are not well organized and coordinated, if these services are not staffed with professionally trained people, they are surely not making the contribution they can and should make either to the student or the institution. A well organized personnel program, the participants felt, is absolutely necessary to bring the ideals of the institution to the individual student and, thus, perhaps alleviate some of his restlessness. It is the fondest hope of the participants that the Workshop has made some contribution to this end.

Liberal Education for a *Changing* World: Integration and the Curriculum

J. Barry McGannon, S.J.

“The problem of education is to make the pupil see the wood *by means of* the trees.”¹

Integration is not a meta-discipline. Integration is a state of mind. It is a state of mind which varies from age to age, from culture to culture, from person to person, and even from time to time for the same person.

What is integration? How is it related to the curriculum? Why should we want to achieve integration? How can we do so?

These four questions will be the focal points for my remarks. Here I gratefully express my very considerable debt to those who have written on this topic. The works of those to whom I am especially indebted are listed in the bibliography.

I. WHAT IS INTEGRATION?

What is integration? Integration means unification, and unity can be understood in a number of ways. It might be a strict unity, an *unum per se* without a real distinction among the parts. But this is obviously too strong a meaning of unity for our purposes here. Here we are thinking of the unification of the elements of a curriculum. And that will never give us an *unum per se*. Unity can also be order and relationship, and in this sense integration means unifying, ordering, or relating some kind of diverse manifold. Integration means fitting things together as

* This paper was read at the 1965 Academic Deans' Workshop and was accepted as a significant addition to the literature on Jesuit Education. It was strongly urged that it be given a wider audience.

¹ Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education*. New York: New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1949. p. 18. (Italics added).

far as this is possible according to their proper relationships to each other.²

If we study it a bit more, I think we will find that integration is not a univocal term. It is, rather, analogous. And integration can mean such diverse things as fitting together the various methods of approaching reality, harmonizing the intellectual and the spiritual aspects of man, trying to unify under some one governing concept the main parts of some discipline like biology, establishing the relationship between theory and its application, or uniting knowledge with action.

Integration, then, means an effort at unification, an understanding of order and relation. And the kinds of integration can be as diverse as the kinds of relation, as diverse as the bases upon which relations are built. Integration, then, is a "relative" term in a very true sense, rather than an absolute term. It is, if you will, an organized sense of relatedness based upon reality as far as we can know it. Let me show you what I mean by a couple of examples.

The African student who is primarily interested in political science may very well find in this discipline his main source of integration, man in organized society and himself as a citizen. Contributory to this integration and aiding him to fit things together will be the knowledge he has gained from history, from economics, from sociology, from geography, from psychology, from theology, and from philosophy. In contrast, the American student who is primarily interested in English and journalism will view political science in quite a different light, not to mention history, and a foreign language, and psychology, and theology and philosophy. In yet greater contrast, the budding young scientist may find that biology integrates things for him, aided by chemistry, and mathematics, and history, and theology, and philosophy. A foreign language may be a mere tool for one student, yet be the principal integrating force in the life of a language major. Thus, even within the ambit of curriculum, integration is probably an analogous term.

From these examples, we can easily discern that there are various levels and kinds of integration. The first kind of integra-

² George P. Klubertanz, S.J., et al. "Integration of the Curriculum and of the Student's Intellectual, Spiritual, Moral, and Religious Life," *Christian Wisdom and Christian Formation*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964. pp. 122-123.

tion is one according to purpose, goals, objectives. Since we are considering the liberal arts student and the curriculum, this first kind of integration requires that the aims, objectives and purposes of liberal education be spelled out and be understood and known. We can call this integration by final cause, teleological integration.³

I don't think you can survey a curriculum and determine simply what subject or subjects would best serve as an integrating factor without some consideration of the why, i.e., what goal you intend to achieve, not so much by the integrating factors (whatever they may be) but by the entire integrated curriculum. What is the purpose that the curriculum is designed to achieve? What sort of graduate does a liberal arts college aim at?

These are questions that do not admit of a single, incontrovertible answer. The answers that a particular educator or educational system will opt for will be determined, by and large, by the educational philosophy that is at work in a particular college. In our own case, the Profile of the Jesuit College Graduate drawn up by the Los Angeles Workshop in 1962 is a good guideline.⁴ It defines the goal of Jesuit college and university undergraduate education in a manner which I think we agree is generally acceptable, even though we might wish for some improvement here or there. I mention this here merely to emphasize that the question of purpose must be answered before we can really consider the integrating factors in a curriculum. I think we can say that this question, as far as the American Jesuit colleges are concerned has been answered. The general question, then, of integration and the curriculum can therefore be rephrased: given the ideal Jesuit graduate of our liberal arts colleges as outlined in the 1962 statement, what factors serve to unify or integrate the program designed to achieve this end?

And this brings us to the second level or kind of integration exemplified again in the cases of the three students whom I described. This kind of integration is that in which we attempt to interrelate the various kinds of human knowledge, to classify and rank them, to understand their similarities and differences, to see their relevance one for the other. We call this second kind

³ *Ibid.* p. 123.

⁴ J. Barry McGannon, S.J., Bernard J. Cooke, S.J. and George P. Klubertanz, S.J. (eds.) *Christian Wisdom and Christian Formation*. pp. 280-281.

of integration, integration by formal cause, ordering activities according to their objects and methods.⁵

Let us dismiss immediately any illusion that in the present state of development of human knowledge there is any hope of fitting all the disciplines into some total plan for a unified system of knowledge with interchangeable concepts equally applicable to the various fields of knowledge. Nor should we harbor any false hopes that we will ever return to that day (if it ever existed) when one finite human mind could learn and comprehend all knowable reality. Knowable reality is expanding by geometric progression and the limits of the human mind and of time for learning, relatively speaking, have not increased at all. Shall we despair, then, and give up all hope of ever achieving in any degree this second kind of integration, by formal cause? I think not.

If you survey the several areas of study that a liberal arts college embraces, you find that each, whatever the individual differences involved, deals with a given section of the intelligible reality. Science deals with the world around man considered as obeying certain physical laws which are known, to a greater or less extent, to the science. Literature deals with man himself, his struggles for self-realization, his hopes and aspirations. History tells of the successes or failures that man has encountered in these same struggles. Mathematics deals with the abstract real. Philosophy deals with the intelligible real taken as a whole, rather than in individual, separate, divided sections. It is the only natural study which deals with the real as such. And theology treats of the real, but considered now as indeed intelligible in itself, but not necessarily intelligible to man.

And so on and on, the entire process being summed up by saying that the liberal arts curriculum is engaged in exposing the student to the real—but to the intelligible real. The whole of the curriculum presupposes an order in reality as the basis for scientific laws, for man's fulfillment or lack thereof, etc. This order is discoverable, and the pursuit of it is, precisely, the essence of liberal education. It is, as Philip Phenix has so well described, the pursuit of "meaning."⁶

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 123.

⁶ Philip H. Phenix, *Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

I reject here the temptation to take up the various disciplines one by one, pointing out how each may serve as an integrating factor and aid in producing the ideal Jesuit graduate. This is done in the reports we have prepared with great effort. And no summary could do justice to these efforts. I would, however, like to direct our collective attention to the fact that this second kind of integration by formal cause cannot take place unless the student has something to integrate. If integration means fitting the pieces together, then the student must have pieces which he possesses as such and as existing in their own right. It is desirable then that the student gain a first hand acquaintance with the various disciplines, that there be a certain tension deliberately maintained between the various ways of knowing so that the student can experience differences as well as integrations and thus grasp the real state of human knowledge today. Otherwise, any attempt at integration will be empty and unreal.

I would further add that integration seems to involve both content and process and that a discipline may provide content important to the student even though its method of studying reality parallels that of another discipline. Similarly, a discipline might be important precisely because it improves the ability of the student to do all those things we describe in the Profile, e.g., "to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate evidence," etc.

This brings us then to the third kind of integration which is exemplified by each of the three students we described earlier. Here I refer, of course, to the kind of integration which can take place only within a person. It is all well and good to speak of the first kind of integration and to spell out aims, goals, purposes, and objectives. And it is well and good to speak of the second kind of integration and to state how the various kinds of knowledge are interrelated. But integration is just an abstract idea until these aims and purposes and this knowledge of the kinds of human knowing are embodied in a person. We designate this third kind as integration in the person, integration by material cause, integration in the student himself. He is one being. His liberal education is designed to develop him as a person. All the factors in his education are chosen for their human relevance, in their meaning for him as a mature Christian person.

In our examples, the integration sought varied for each student. And it is almost certain that the degree of integration achieved by each student varied considerably depending on his

own motivation and interests, his own cultural background, his native talents, the vocation he was seeking, and the society and world he was preparing for. And we may be quite certain that for each of these students the kind and degree of integration achieved at commencement would undergo change in the years ahead and that the factors mentioned both inside the individual and in his environment would produce further changes. Our task as educators is to assess all these factors and to try to produce the maximum degree and kind of integration that is possible when all the circumstances are weighed into account. Realism demands that we assess not only the world in which our students will enter but the world they will be living in twenty-five or fifty years from now. It also demands that we give full weight and value to those integrating factors which all persons need precisely as fully developed human persons.⁷

II. HOW IS INTEGRATION RELATED TO THE CURRICULUM?

How are the curriculum and integration related to each other? They are related quite simply as means to end. Here I cannot improve on what Father Mallon wrote in the very first issue of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* in 1938.⁸ Curriculum is obviously not an end in itself, but a means to an end. The first question to settle is whether we actually want the means or the end. If we want the means, the curriculum, then we ought to keep the curriculum and add other subjects from time to time and continue to hope that the theoretical end will follow. I'm afraid this has happened more often than we care to admit in the history of American and of Jesuit higher education.

Here we can perhaps profitably digress for a moment to reach back into our own tradition for a lesson from history, one which

⁷ The subject matter of this Workshop is concerned with the realization of the ideal Jesuit graduate through the means of the core curriculum. The subject matter for the Workshop has thus been limited to those things which can be obtained through one means, through the curriculum. I am likewise limiting my consideration of integration to that which can be accomplished through the curriculum. Other forms of integration, all important, are described in pages 61-64 of the materials prepared for this Workshop. The Los Angeles Workshop had to do with integration of two subjects in the curriculum and with the integration of the students' intellectual, spiritual, moral and religious life. Some of these other integrating factors are: the presence of Jesuits in the various departments, the concept of the college or university as an academic community, the sodality as a means of fostering the integration of knowledge and action. All of these are admittedly most important but they lie outside the subject matter of this paper and of this Workshop.

⁸ Wilfred M. Mallon, S.J. "The Future of the Jesuit College Curriculum," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*. 1 (1938) 14-22.

applies to this meeting and to each of us individually. As recently as 1961, when departments of philosophy submitted materials for the Los Angeles Workshop, one department consistently referred to the *Ratio Studiorum* as the reason for requiring each course in philosophy. Whoever gave that as the reason should have known that whatever prescriptive force the *Ratio* still had was finally and completely abolished by Decree No. 12 of the Twenty-Fifth General Congregation in the year 1906.⁹ And the General Congregation acted, interestingly enough, because it regarded the curriculum as a means, not as an end, and recognized that changing world conditions and variations from one country to another made it impossible to prescribe a single curriculum for the world.¹⁰

There are sound reasons for teaching philosophy, but the prescriptive force of the *Ratio* is not one of them. Let us beware of the temptation to bolster our case for this or that subject by reasons that lack validity. And let us also beware of the temptation to try by legislation to immortalize the curriculum that we

⁹ *Decreta Vigesima Quintae Congregationis Generalis a restituta Societate sextae*. (Romae, 1906) Decretum 12. The Latin text is quoted at length by McGucken, *The Jesuits and Education*, pp. 146-147.

¹⁰ Miguel A. Bernad, S.J., *The Faculty of Arts in the Jesuit Colleges in the Eastern Part of the United States: Theory and Practice (1782-1923)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1951. p. 347 ff. Father Bernad discusses the decree as follows:

The content of that decree may be outlined as follows:

1. First, the General Congregation took note of the fact that many of the provinces of the Society of Jesus had sent in petitions for the formulation of a new *Ratio Studiorum* — a plan of studies, that is, which would be a revision of the revised *Ratio Studiorum* of 1832. Having noted this fact, the General Congregation decided not to accede to the request. The reason given was that the time was unpropitious: education throughout the world was in a chaotic state, constantly changing, and differing from place to place.

2. Nevertheless, although a new *Ratio* could not be drafted, the General Congregation earnestly recommended the study of "that sound pedagogical system" which was Jesuit education. The language used by the Congregation is interesting because it indicates the main sources in which the Jesuit pedagogical system is to be found:

We very strongly recommend, however, the study of that sound pedagogical system, the principles of which are outlined by our holy Founder in the Fourth Part of the *Constitutions*: which was developed in detail in the *Ratio Studiorum*, and which was made the subject of detailed commentaries by the writers of the society.

3. Thirdly, the Congregation explicitly admitted that the *Ratio Studiorum* — even the revised *Ratio* of Father Roothaan (1832) — could no longer be followed in every respect in present times.

4. Since this was the case and since the problems confronting the schools and colleges varied with the region, these problems should be solved on a local or regional basis. Consequently, instead of a plan of studies to be drawn up for the entire Society, each province or regional group of provinces was to draw up a plan of studies for the schools and the colleges within its own territory.

5. Finally, in drawing up this plan of studies, the provincial was to seek the advice of his consultants and of the more experienced professors in the various institutions within his territory, and the plan of studies was to be submitted for approval to Father General.

In response to that decree of their supreme legislative body, the various provinces of the Society of Jesus proceeded to draw up plans of studies for their schools . . .

think is ideal. It should be a living thing, vibrant, subject to change and responsive to its environment like any living organism.

Curriculum, then, is a means, and only a means. It is to be treated and used as a means. And like good Jesuits, we will call upon all our knowledge of the Spiritual Exercises as we seek to use the curriculum. In selecting the subjects of the curriculum as means to our end, we will invoke the Ignatian principles of the *tantum quantum*, of indifference, and, yes, even of the *magis*. Following the directives of the Planning Committee for this Workshop, we will consider that no course or sequence of courses has the right of establishment, i.e., no course or sequence of courses is an end in itself, but only a means. And in reviewing these courses and deciding for the future, we will use courses in as far as they lead us to the end, and we will not use those courses which do not lead us to the end. In those areas where, because of our own background or our own peculiar interest or specialty we are inclined to favor one course over another, we will try to practice true Ignatian indifference and look at the situation as objectively as possible. Finally, we will try as far as we can to practice the *magis* of the Foundation. Our one desire and choice will be for what is more conducive to the end which we seek.

We are realistic enough to concede that we will never arrive at infallibly efficacious means in education since we are always dealing with human beings on whom the curriculum will be but one of many important influences. And we are also realistic enough to know that it has never been demonstrated even with respect to the most specific and immediate goals that all men must employ identical means for their attainment. Since the curriculum is but a means, it is not out of place to suggest that we seriously think of ways of adapting the curriculum to the students rather than vice versa. We all know the difficulties. But we all would have to admit that we cannot prove that all freshmen should take the same course in freshman English, or perhaps any freshman English at all, yet we persist in making the curriculum an end and force the student to fit into it. To be sure, to differentiate course work for students of varied ability and background involves administrative problems, but we administrators, like the subjects of the curriculum, are but means to an end and expendable.¹¹

11 Laurence V. Britt, S.J., "Objectives of the Curriculum," *Proceedings of the Santa Clara Institute for Jesuit College Deans*. New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1955. p. 66.

If curriculum is a means, what is it a means to? It is a means to integration, among other things. And that brings us to the next question we wish to consider.

III. WHY SHOULD WE WANT TO ACHIEVE INTEGRATION?

Why should we want to achieve integration? We can grant, it is true, that the curriculum is a means and only a means to integration. But this only raises a deeper problem. If integration is what we aim at and hope to achieve through the curriculum, is it an aim or objective of liberal education? If it is not one of the aims of liberal education, then perhaps we are only pretending, erecting a structure without foundation. Yes, integration is an important aim of liberal education and for a number of important reasons, as we shall explain in a moment. But it is not out of place here to mention that integration is only one of many aims and objectives of liberal education, and that it functions principally as a mediate rather than an ultimate end of education. In this sense integration would seem to serve as an *end* or purpose of the curriculum, but integration also serves as a *means* toward the ultimate ends of a happy and rewarding human life in this world and in the next.

Integration is important for liberal education because relationships among the fields of knowing do exist in reality and the human mind can learn them. Knowledge is not adequately defined by the "bits" which we entrust to the memory banks of the computer. Rather a full definition of knowledge includes both its content and the relations of that content to other knowledge. Human beings are essentially creatures who have the power to experience meanings. Distinctively human existence consists in a pattern of meanings. A liberal education is the process of engendering essential meanings.¹²

Even to be a really good specialist, a person needs a knowledge of the other disciplines. The value of any subject is enhanced by an understanding of its relationships with other subjects and its distinctive features are best comprehended in the light of its similarities and contrasts with other subjects. In a world of interconnection, the requirement is even more urgent that each specialist know how he fits into the whole scheme of things and how to take his appropriate responsibility for the well-being of the entire

¹² Phenix. *Op. cit.* p. 3.

civilized endeavor. Such understanding cannot be gained by specialization alone.¹³

Integration is properly a goal for an educated man because man is possessed of reflective intelligence, the ability to seek for meaning in reality, the ability to consciously consider the whole of reality from many different approaches and to interrelate these into a wisdom that has depth as well as breadth. Integration thus gives a new dimension to human knowledge. It gives depth replacing superficiality.

Integration by means of the curriculum is important because of the relevance of integrated knowledge as a well-spring for distinctively human action. Integrated knowledge can provide not only a knowledge of ultimate and mediate ends, but a knowledge of the means for achieving these ends and some of the motivation for doing so.

In this rapidly changing world of ours, integration of human knowledge may be one of the few means we have for training our students to cope with the knowledge explosion in the years ahead. The old conception of the school as a place for accumulating knowledge to be used over a lifetime is no longer appropriate. Much of the knowledge that will be needed in the future has not yet been discovered. And much of what he may acquire in school will soon be obsolete. If schooling is not to become an exercise in futility, it is imperative that students acquire the kind of learning that will provide a knowledge of basic methods and kinds of knowledge so that he will have the tools needed for assimilating content not yet discovered or developed.¹⁴ Liberal education for this changing world must be an education in which the curriculum serves as a means to lead the student to integrated knowledge.

IV. HOW CAN WE ACHIEVE INTEGRATION BY MEANS OF THE CURRICULUM?

Let us now attempt to set down in some orderly fashion some guidelines which, hopefully, will enable us to achieve the highest possible level of integration in our graduates. We are all painfully aware of the limits of our endeavors. And we all know full well that other important integrating factors are at work in the lives of our students: family, campus mores, the influence of compan-

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 334.

ions, extra curricular activities, parish religious activities, and a host of others. We recognize the importance of all of these. But here we must confine ourselves to the influence of the content and manner of formal instruction, to the curriculum, as a means whereby our students may achieve integration.

To provide a basis for discussion I have selected eleven guidelines which will help us achieve integration. They vary considerably in importance, but I think all of them are relevant. You may wish to add others of your own.'

Guideline 1: Aims and objectives are paramount in determining the degree and kind of integration which we seek to achieve through the curriculum. Here we are working within the framework of American Jesuit liberal education, preparing graduates for happiness in this world and the next. Fortunately, the goals we are trying to achieve are spelled out already in the Profile of the Jesuit College Graduate and we accept them as directly relevant to what we are attempting here. We accept this Profile, not because it is a given, but because it embodies what we profess to achieve in our graduates. Even though we may wish to amend the statement here or there, I think there is overwhelming agreement that it embodies our philosophy of education, a philosophy which relies incidentally on truths from many disciplines.

Guideline 2: The liberal arts college is a creation of society and its curriculum must be responsive to the needs of that society. If there is one lesson that is clear from the history of liberal education, it is that liberal education which fails to grow and develop with the society which it nurtures and which nurtures it, will shortly cease to be effective. That liberal arts college which is not responsive to the society around it will soon become a relic, an antique, an object of curiosity perhaps, but unwanted by members of its faculty, unmourned by alumni and benefactors, and unacceptable to the society it serves. This does not mean that it must accomplish this objective in the most efficient and effective possible manner, freely substituting more efficient means for those that have become outmoded. What could be more Ignatian than the principle of adaptation to times and places so strongly recommended in Part IV of the Constitutions?

Guideline 3: The fact of rapid change in modern society must be given appropriate weight in emphasizing methodology in the curriculum. The burgeoning nature of human knowledge requires no documentation. One need only recall that by far the majority

of scientists in the entire history of the world are alive today. Knowledge continually undergoes modification. New discoveries are made requiring revision of older ideas that may have been developed by similar methods. While it may prove impossible for a person to keep pace with the advancing tide of knowledge in a discipline, he may be able quite satisfactorily to remain abreast of the methods of inquiry in it.¹⁵

These considerations are of paramount importance for the modern educator in a time of rapid cultural transformation. The content of what is learned at any given time is likely to be unusable before many years have passed. And as we indicated before, much of the knowledge that will be needed in the future has not yet been discovered, and much that we learn now will soon be obsolete. Curricular content should be chosen so as to exemplify the methods of inquiry and the modes of understanding in the discipline studied. It is more important for the student to become skillful in the ways of knowing than to learn about any particular product of investigation. Knowledge of methods makes it possible for a person to continue learning and to undertake inquiries on his own. Furthermore, the modes of thought are far less transient than are the products of inquiry. Concentration on methods also helps to overcome two forms of meaninglessness: the fragmentation of knowledge and the surfeit of materials to be learned. Every discipline is unified by its methods which are the common source of all the conclusions reached in that field of study.¹⁶

Guideline 4: Integration can proceed most effectively when the student understands the disciplines. Each field of knowledge must preserve its proper autonomy. Strictly speaking the student cannot integrate what he does not understand. The content of the curriculum should be drawn from the fields of disciplined inquiry. The richness of culture and the level of understanding achieved in advanced civilization are due almost entirely to the labors of individual men of genius and of organized communities of specialists working within a field of knowledge. Every person is indebted for what he has and is to a great network of skilled inventors, experimenters, artists, scholars and saints who have devoted their special talents to the well-being of all. No one, no matter how capable, can make any perceptible progress on his own without

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 9.

dependence on the experts in the various fields of human endeavor. It follows that the teacher should utilize the disciplines as a most dependable resource for instructional materials. While he should seek to make the disciplines and materials his own, he should not presume to originate the knowledge to be taught, nor should he expect the fruits of learning to come forth as if by miracle from the shared experiences of the students, or as the products of common sense.¹⁷

The term, discipline, is not meant to refer to an unchanging set of established fields of knowledge. New disciplines are constantly emerging as the old established disciplines are expanded and divided. Many established disciplines are undergoing radical internal transformation. We need only consider fields like nuclear physics, microbiology, and theology to name a few. In fact, there is hardly a field of study that is not different today from what it was only a few decades ago.

Guideline 5: Each separate discipline is, in a sense, partially responsible for the achievement of integration. In the liberal arts curriculum, it is true that the discipline itself must be taught and not merely taught about. It is also true that each discipline must be reflectively and self-consciously taught, i.e., it should be taught in such a way that the student learns not only the principal content and methodology of that discipline, but also learns what it can accomplish, what it is unfitted to accomplish, and what its relations are to other disciplines. While cross-disciplinary studies within a single course often prove to be superficial, it is important for students to learn by the variety of concurrent studies how to cross disciplinary lines and to come to appreciate from first hand acquaintance the special genius of each discipline and its potential contribution to an integrated view of reality. Every discipline is to some degree integrative in nature. Every discipline makes use of materials from other disciplines. And some disciplines, by their very logic are strongly integrative. Every discipline, if properly taught, can make at least a negative contribution to integration by spelling out its own limits.

Guideline 6: The liberal arts curriculum should be comprehensive. It should include the major modes of human knowing. If the student has contact with only two or three approaches to reality, he will be lacking the materials needed for integration.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

Not every discipline need be taught to every student, but the principal approaches to truth should be experienced by the student, so that he can comprehend their potentials and their limitations.

Guideline 7: Selectivity of curricular content is essential for an integrated liberal education. Operating within the framework of the four-year liberal arts college, it is plain that no teacher can teach and no student can learn all there is to know about a group of disciplines, nor even about a single discipline. This makes imperative a selection of curricular content. This selection will be among disciplines and within disciplines. Within disciplines contents should be chosen so as to exemplify the representative ideas of the discipline.

A representative idea is an idea that represents the discipline in which it occurs. It is a typical idea in the sense that it reveals the type or kind of the discipline. It is a characteristic idea in the sense that it manifests the character of the discipline. Representative ideas are concepts that afford an understanding of the main features of the discipline.

Representative ideas exist because disciplines have form pattern or structure. A representative concept represents the pattern of the discipline. It characterizes the structure of that field of inquiry. It is an idea that enables one to distinguish one discipline from another. A discipline is not merely a collection of various and sundry ideas; it has a characteristic logic that provides a standard for judging whether or not any given item belongs to the discipline and if it does, how it fits together with the other components in the field. Representative ideas are the organizing principles of the discipline.

Representative ideas are clearly of great importance in economizing learning effort. If there are certain characteristic concepts of the discipline that represent it, then a thorough understanding of these ideas is equivalent to a knowledge of the entire discipline. If knowledge within a discipline is organized according to certain patterns, then a full comprehension of those patterns goes far toward making intelligible the host of particular elements that fit into the design of the subject.

Content in a course should be chosen so it will exemplify the representative ideas of the disciplines. The word "exemplify" is important. We do not say that the representative ideas themselves should be taught as explicit concepts. These ideas are of a highly abstract nature. They belong to the philosophical analysis of the

disciplines. They have no place in the actual content of instruction at the introductory stages. The most fundamental ideas are usually not appropriate as explicit content until a fairly advanced stage of understanding has been reached. They are high abstractions that are not meaningful except to persons who possess a considerable fund of knowledge in the subject to which they apply. The less comprehensive ideas are, the more easily they can be understood by the beginning student.

What, then, is the use of the representative ideas if they are not suitable from the beginning as curriculum content? Their function is to guide the selection of learnable content so that it will exemplify the characteristic features of the disciplines. The place of the representative ideas is not in the first instance on the lips of the teacher but in his mind to direct him in the choice of learning experiences that will illustrate the ideas he has in mind. The essential point is that at every stage of instruction, the representative ideas should govern what is taught. Every particular should manifest the larger concept that it illustrates. The poor teacher piles item upon item of information and experience only making certain that each contribution falls within the subject being pursued. A good teacher, by contrast, chooses each item or experience with the deliberate purpose of giving substance to certain basic concepts that are distinctive of the discipline studied.¹⁸

Guideline 8: Because integration is possible through a variety of means, organization of the curriculum should take advantage of this flexibility. Given the necessity for selectivity in the curriculum, it is helpful to realize that alternate routes to integration are possible. This means that it is possible for a smaller college to provide a liberal education even though it does not teach all possible disciplines. It also means that students need not pursue identical curricula in order to obtain an integrated education. Here we may profitably recall that the distinction between liberal and specialized education is admittedly vague and imprecise. It is difficult in any concrete case to make a clearcut and unequivocal judgment between the two. In fact, it is not necessary. "The significant distinction is between studies to develop *kinds* of understanding, (not *particular* understandings) that *everybody* needs simply because he is human, and studies intended to develop kinds of understanding that only *some* people need in

¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 322.

order to fulfill certain particular individual or social ends. Evidently, the judgment as to whether a study is general or special does not apply to content as such, but to the relation between content and purpose for the given person and situation. An item of knowledge that is an essential ingredient in the humanizing of one person may be used by another for special purposes.”¹⁹ This idea opens up the whole area of liberal versus professional studies, of the place of the major in the student’s program, and the perpetual tendency of students themselves to instrumentalize their learning.

Guideline 9: Integration takes place in the student. Integration is not something that exists *a parte rei*. There apparently is no meta-discipline called integration, though philosophy, theology and history provide many of the principles for integrating human knowledges, and for integrating human knowledge and action. As with all learning, the student is the principal cause of the acquisition of this additional perfection which we call integration. Consequently, all of our efforts must culminate in the student. We must provide the building blocks for integration in the right curriculum. But ultimately only the student can integrate. In addition to various means already mentioned, we might consider by way of example the indirect causality which produces integration through preparation for oral and written comprehensives in senior year. Such means as these are often quite influential in enabling the student to acquire an integrated viewpoint.

Guideline 10: The teacher’s role in producing an integrated student cannot be overestimated. “The special office of the teacher in liberal education is to mediate the knowledge of the specialist in the discipline so as to reveal the general human relevance of this knowledge. The teacher is to be a humanizer of knowledge and in *this* capacity he does not act as an authority himself, though he may also be a specialist in this sense, but is one whose task is to make available and vital to the student the understandings developed within the discipline.”²⁰ Thus, teaching in liberal education is functionally distinct from the special work of those who produce and justify knowledge in particular fields of scholarship. The teacher’s mediation is essential because the thought of the beginner is necessarily rudimentary in comparison with that

¹⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 271-272.

²⁰ *Ibid.* p. 315.

of the specialist. Moreover, the teacher must so present the materials from his discipline that he communicates as well the limits of that discipline and its relations to other disciplines. He may do this both directly and indirectly, and in both approaches he will serve that most important function of exemplar cause, showing himself an integrated person, and one worthy of imitation.

In the ideal order each teacher of each discipline must teach his course with integration in mind. In addition, it seems entirely reasonable to provide for our students a course in the division of the sciences which, imperfect though it may be, will provide an essential framework which will be of vital assistance to the student as he progresses through life and assimilates new knowledge as it is developed. This should not be a course in the philosophy department, though some professors of philosophy would undoubtedly be competent to teach it, because this is a broader course than philosophy. It should not have to bracket theology or take revelation as merely hypothetically possible, as philosophy does. The ideal teacher of such a course is one who has himself attained this integration and has a sufficient amount of detailed knowledge of the various disciplines to do a just and accurate job on their starting points, their methods, their effects on the whole person, the type of truth they reach, their values, their limitations, etc. Does this sound impossible? Perhaps, but I would venture to say that each of our schools has at least one such man hidden away and perhaps fettered somewhere. No one person is a universal genius, and such is not required, but just someone who is acquainted with the major disciplines and who is open to discussion with those in other departments than his own. Perhaps the second semester of junior year would be the time for such a course, leaving ample opportunity for the student to apply what he learns as he prepares for senior comprehensives.

Guideline 11: The responsibility for producing integrated students must be shared by the dean, the faculty member, and the student. It is common practice at meetings to shift the responsibility from the shoulders of those present to the shoulders of those absent. Let us here face up to the fact that we will never attain the goal of integration through the curriculum unless all of the causative factors conspire together. Let us, as deans, fix our share of the responsibility right now.

If we can state, as we have, that there is no single integrating discipline, but that each discipline contributes something to inte-

gration, and if we can state, as we have, that certain disciplines, notably philosophy, theology and history, have a rather substantial role to play in helping to point out the relationships and the order among disciplines, and if we admit, as I think we rightfully can, that no single discipline can effect integration in the student, how, I ask you, can integration be achieved? Or, are we merely whistling in the dark, giving lip service to something which we do not, in the final analysis, feel is important or do not, in the final analysis, intend to achieve any way?

Integration is a goal, one of the objectives of liberal education. Goals and objectives are in the order of final causality. Goals and objectives are determined by responsible human beings, and as responsible human beings, as statesmen responsible for the future state of liberal education in the Jesuit colleges in the United States, we must somehow find the means to exercise our responsibility of seeing to it that our students receive an integrated education.

If integration in the final analysis takes place only in the student, then we are responsible for setting up those requirements and conditions which will not only make it possible for integration to take place in the mind of the student, but to force the development of this integration in so far as this is possible by the means available to us. Our responsibility is to determine (in consultation with faculty, etc.) upon a curriculum which will provide the building blocks of integration. It is our further responsibility to so arrange this curriculum that the student will have an opportunity to experience the various kinds of human knowing. In addition, we must provide a faculty who know their own disciplines, and know the limits and relations of their disciplines to others, and we must see to it that in the classroom they communicate this knowledge. Here we recognize the importance of faculty selection, and perhaps inservice education, in order to assure this kind of education to our students. Moreover, we must see to it that we provide instruction of high caliber in those disciplines especially which are important for integrating disciplines other than their own.

No one group can function in isolation. Deans, faculty members and students must conspire together and must assume their own share of the responsibility for producing graduates who will achieve integration and exemplify in their lives the ideal Jesuit College Graduate so well described in the 1962 Profile.

Jesuit, Priest, and Scholar

A Theory of our Learned Apostolates

by
Paul M. Quay, S.J.

In large numbers, Ours are called upon to fill the three-fold role of Jesuit, priest, and scholar. Since a man can lead an integral and satisfying Christian life as any one of these without being either of the others, it is not surprising that the man in whom all three must be combined should, on occasion, sense an internal conflict. For the resolution of this conflict, a clear vision of the principle and bond of unity between his three roles is necessary. A number of theories have been worked out to provide such a vision, without, it would seem, complete success. The present article seeks to continue this movement of investigation, first looking carefully at the two polar positions towards which these various theories have been drawn, and then proposing an alternative theory, some consequences of which are then developed in regard to our present university apostolate and the closely related problem of our poverty.

I. The Polar Positions

A. Pretense of Scholarship The problem of the relationships in the life of a priest, between scholarship (knowledge, science, profane learning) and religion (spirituality, apostolate, theology) has long been a vexed one. In the United States the commonest solutions given it have tended, until recently, to consider scholarly knowledge and research simply as an enticement to bring people within the range of the priest's influence. Scholarly pursuits are regarded as a sort of bait on a hook, as a decoy whereby the priest draws others on till he can drop the pretense and get busy with their conversion or spiritual development.

One form of this attitude is that of the purely "practical" man, who can see no apostolic value in truth unless he understands immediately how he might use it in a sermon or retreat. Another, less obvious, form is found among those who regard knowledge

or, at least, any increase of knowledge in profane fields as, at best, irrelevant to the spiritual life. Even a brief glance, however, at the history of spirituality and at the changes wrought, for example, by modern psychology in the interpretation of unusual states of soul, or by linguistics and archaeology in the more recent approaches to Scripture, or by historical method in its delimitation of the range of certifiable miracles or in its manifestation of the impact of cultural conditioning on the religious thought of even the greatest saints, shows clearly that external grace may not be circumscribed within the domain of the specifically religious. Much more plausible now is the position that everything in the natural order is ordained by God to act in one way or another as an external grace for man.

Underlying the attitude of "baiting the hook" there seems to lurk not so much an unconcern for knowledge and its value for human life as an over-concern: there is a worry and disturbance at the prospect of the failing of familiar concepts, of the pain of intellectual reorganization from the foundations; there is fright at the sight of the vast labor that must be expended to reintegrate adequately one's vision of the world and God. That these are unworthy attitudes for people involved with the things of the mind is obvious. That they are spiritually damaging to those who hold them and destructive to the souls of others is perhaps not quite as obvious but is just as certain. Going directly against the docility to God's grace required of every Christian — for His grace sooner or later acts in ways quite foreign to human modes of thinking, no matter how well developed — such attitudes imply an excessive reliance on creatures and seek a security in our human understanding and culturally-conditioned expressions of the Faith which it is not at all clear God desires us to have. To use truth as a decoy seems, at root, a denial of the holiness and transcendence of God.

B. Autonomous Scholarship In opposition, attitudes inclining toward "autonomous scholarship" have grown up. Rightly rejecting the former theories, this position argues that every discipline should be pursued purely for its own intrinsic goodness: truth. To act otherwise, it is said, is implicitly to deny the transcendental character of truth, to make of an end, albeit not ultimate, a mere means. Since, moreover, the secular disciplines cannot be contradictory to faith or right reason, they may and ought to be

pursued autonomously, without subordination, save in a purely negative sense, even to theology. In any case, they have no need of borrowing from philosophy, still less from theology, to aid them internally.

It is pointed out, furthermore, that a scholarship which is completely free of any ulterior motivation is nonetheless profoundly and intrinsically apostolic. For, as already mentioned, all advances in human knowledge, whether by a single individual or by society at large, would seem to represent in God's actual providence external graces, intended to lead men closer to Him. Moreover, a priestly scholar, merely by being such, bears witness before all men to the value, in the eyes of the Church, of integral truth at every level of existence. To demand, further, an extrinsic apostolic utility would be to introduce a basic heteronomy which could only eventuate in the destruction of both science and the apostolate.

Thus the seeking for, the finding, and the contemplating of the truth about any aspect of the world through its appropriate science (or about God through philosophy and theology) are sufficiently good to form an adequate object, in themselves, of priestly endeavor. Even the Jesuit priest who, apart from obligatory spiritual exercises, does nothing save research in library or laboratory is doing more than enough to justify his being in such work. To subordinate scholarship to an apostolate other than itself, however it may be done, is simply to return to "baiting the hook."¹

C. Critique of Autonomous Scholarship Evidently, there are two elements in the position just sketched which need not always be united. One of these rejects any "extrinsic" subordination of scholarship, i.e., subordination to a goal other than the knowledge of truth; the other rejects any "intrinsic" subordination, i.e., to a goal belonging to the order of the knowledge of truth but proper to a higher aspect or discipline than the one subordinated. What lies behind each of these rejections is, of course, the fear that the search for truth will be compromised or corrupted by subordination to anything other than the goal and methods proper to each particular discipline.

Despite the abundant examples of corruption, however, which

1. As with the previous position, we have not hesitated, in order to mark more precisely the poles of discussion and tension, to present "autonomous scholarship" in somewhat less qualified form than do those who tend verbally in its direction. The hope is that in the end all parties can say, "That's what I've thought all along," perhaps, however, with new clarity of vision.

have given rise to these fears, such a position sins by its timidity and its tendency towards angelism. Speaking realistically, there is little scholarship of any description which is not extrinsically subordinated to things other than the desire to know. A scholar's choice of a topic of research will be based not only upon his personal interests at the time but also upon his financial needs and desires, the good he foresees to the community from his work, the facilities available to him at the moment. The amount of time he gives to his research is conditioned similarly by his relations with his family, his economic position, his membership and activities in professional societies, civic committees, political-action groups, and so on. There is certainly no need for a Jesuit to apologize for an extrinsic subordination of scholarship to apostolic ends, provided that his scholarship remains true to itself. At least no other scholar's integrity is necessarily compromised by his accepting a teaching position at a university, for example, in order to make a living nor even, if he be a scientist, by his working for industry in order to make a better one. If the degree of subordination be greater in the case of the priest, this need indicate nothing more than the higher rank in finality of supernatural ends.

A theory of scholarship autonomous of intrinsic subordination would seem to be based on a rather shallow view of knowledge and of the world. The "autonomy" of disciplines at more or less the same level (e.g., physics, chemistry, metallurgy, engineering) is severely limited. Though there is a certain diversity in goals and in the types of question asked or in the viewpoint from which they are asked, there can be no question of simple independence. No one discipline can advance far without the others.

On the other hand, disciplines from radically different levels interpenetrate, the higher irradiating and activating the lower, the lower setting problems, contexts, and conditions for the higher (e.g., the ascending scale of physics; mathematics, philosophy, theology; also, the use by great scientists of aesthetic, personalist, and philosophic criteria as the primary ones in the construction of theory). The strong surge towards interdepartmentalization in American universities is proof that educators are aware of this fact.

More basically, the universe is one; no created being exists in complete independence of any other. The corresponding branches of learning can have no greater independence. Moreover, the knower is one. Whatever he learns becomes part of him and

part of the context in terms of which he will seek understanding of every new item of knowledge.²

These two unities are of particular importance for the question of priestly learning since they combine to make the relations of theology to other knowledge singularly complex. On the one hand, theology has, in common with the deposit of faith, the direct and primary content of supernatural revelation, graspable as true only by faith, and is thus distinct from philosophy and all profane sciences. But on the other hand, theology is a scientific discipline which is, even where itself part of revelation, the work of the human mind attempting to discover reflexly and to express in its own fashion what has been revealed to it and also to understand the significance of the revelation for human life and thought. Theology is thus inseparably linked to philosophy and, through it, in completely continuous fashion to all branches of human learning, the closeness of the linkage depending not only on the intrinsic nature of things but on the modes of human understanding and styles of thought at any given point of history. Thus today technology, economic structure, physical and biological science not only pose interesting new questions for the theologian but also offer him new categories of thought with which to seek understanding of ancient questions.

The interrelationship and continuity between theology and the other intellectual disciplines makes heresy a psychological possibility distinct from simple unbelief; hence also the importance of profane learning in the defence of the Faith. It is this same interrelationship that suggests that God may desire to use all human knowledge as external grace. In all the above points, it will be noted, insistence on intrinsic subordination offers, in fact, increased support for the concept of an apostolate intrinsic to scholarship; without intrinsic subordination, indeed, no Christian value whatever could be found in human learning.

II. Priesthood and Scholarship

But granted the existence of an apostolate intrinsic to scholarship, this does not prove that such an apostolate is, in general, an adequate or suitable one for Jesuits. On the other hand, one could admit that an extrinsic subordination of one sort or another

2. An introduction to a more profound discussion of this, as well as a number of other points discussed in this section of this article, is to be found in an abridged translation of a letter of Fr. Karl Rahner, S.J., *Studium*, III-1, 10-12 (Dec., 1962).

can be had without damage to scholarship and yet question whether an extrinsic subordination to apostolic ends is necessary or even desirable as justification of a Jesuit's engaging in scholarly work.

To deal with this problem, we shall consider the Jesuit's relations to scholarship in virtue, first, of his type of sacramental union with the Church, the manner in which he is her sacramentally constituted representative; then, of his type of spirituality in relation to the world; finally, of his properly Jesuit characteristics.

A. Hierarchical Division of Functions As we have seen, all knowledge, profane as well as sacred, is relevant and of interest to the Church, both in itself and in its applications. But the relationship of the Church to human learning is mediated in different manners by her various members.

Every baptized person has a priesthood whose function is the worship of God through His creation by the elevation of the temporal order into its proper relation with the supernatural.³ The temporal order includes all the rational disciplines: not only sciences, humanities, philosophy, but theology as well, to the extent that this is a scientific study distinct from the content of faith. Whence the integration of, say, contemporary biological thought, philosophy, and theology is of itself part of the layman's function, provided only that he is properly competent in the fields he seeks to relate.⁴ This possibility can no longer be dismissed by identifying the theologian, at least on the practical order, with the priest. There are today, in growing numbers, laymen who are competent, even professionally so, in theology; and many of these — especially those who are brothers, nuns, or members of those Secular Institutes established expressly for university apostolates — are as keenly interested in such integration as are priests.⁵

Whoever has received Confirmation has received an official call to bring the Good News to others in accord with the particular apostolate of his state, at least by the fortitude and courage of his

3. We deliberately avoid at this point any consideration of the modifications which must be introduced once the baptized undertakes to live according to the spirituality of a Religious Order. This will be seen later.

4. We use the term "lay" in its classical Catholic sense to refer to one who is consecrated sacramentally to God's service but without the Sacrament of Orders.

5. As pointed out by Fr. Rahner (*op. cit.*, p. 12), this desire for integration springs both from the unity of the knower, who, being a Christian as well as scholar, has this task thrust upon him, and also from the intrinsic subordination of his field to theology and other areas of truth. Hence to reserve such integration to priests is to imply a perennial infantilism of the laity.

life as a Christian, i.e., by the strength of his witness. All means of apostolate short of those given in the Sacrament of Orders are open to him; and an intrinsic apostolate of scholarship gains here its consecration. Likewise, Confirmation represents the layman's commission to teach the rational disciplines, theology included, as a means of apostolate, always, of course, in dependence on his bishop.

The powers of the diaconate, brought into prominence again by the Council, are rooted in the Church's need to handle temporal affairs while leaving her bishops and priests free for their characteristic functions. From the beginning, too, the deacon has had a special trust in terms of the Word of God and preaching. If the Church has need of ordained scholars, it might well be the deacons who are, in virtue of their office, best suited to the task.

The priesthood of the ordained priest makes him an extension of his bishop (for Jesuits, of the Pope) in the proclamation of the Faith, the ruling of the faithful, and the sanctifying of all men by Sacrifice and Sacraments. With regard to the laity, the ordained priest is to be the dynamic source through which God stimulates and effects the layman's spiritual growth, perfection, apostolate.

The ordained priest, since baptized and confirmed, can rightly do anything the layman can (save for the prescriptions of the Church's positive law) if the Church gives him such a task to accomplish. But the criteria for what things he ought to be chosen are evidently much narrower; contingent necessities aside, he should be reserved for those things which only he can do, i.e., which are rooted essentially in the priestly functions listed in the last paragraph. It is true that bishops and priests can be and often have been obliged for the good of the Church to take on lay functions due to lack of an adequate laity. Yet, as in the whole vexed area of Church-State relations, only harm results from any attempts to render such a dislocation of function permanent or to prevent its restoration to normal.

B. Scholarship—a Priestly Function? The question, then, to be answered as to the scholarship of priests is whether there are any types or aspects of scholarship which are proper to priests, which in principle only those with this sacrament of Orders can develop or utilize. A fair number of Jesuits think that there are such aspects.

The arguments they adduce are basically these: Firstly, some

priests will always be needed in all major fields of scholarly endeavor: on the one hand, to convince laymen of the Church's competence and interest; to help them, by example as well as by exhortation, to integrate the exacting demands of a solid and apostolic spiritual life with the exacting demands of their intellectual labors; to be able adequately and sympathetically to understand the religious problems, moral and intellectual, peculiar to each field; on the other hand, to bring the fruits of scholarship to their bishops and fellow-priests. For, all theological systems are not merely rational disciplines but also reflections of the kerygma; as such, they are always under the supervision of the bishops. Hence serious harm can result if the bishops do not have among those closest to them men who can explain to them the true content and bearing of the new systems.

Moreover, it is held that some priestly scholars will always be needed for the apostolate to the non-Catholic world. Not only is it the priest, above all, who is the image of the Church to those outside but it is one of his special functions, under the bishop, to proclaim the Gospel to those who have not yet received it, among whom must be counted a fearsomely high percentage of the world's scholars.

More profoundly, it is argued that priests must be provided by the Church for all men, whether her members yet or not. Whence, every priest receives a "mission," is sent by the Church to some more or less clearly specified group of men, becoming thus their apostle. It is with this group that he should become identified and to whom he should adapt all his thought and effort, as did our Lord with regard to His own people. Some priests, then, must be sent to each major category of scholars and must, at least, come to know their "language" and cast of mind. It is far better, though, that, like our Lord, he should become one of the group he seeks to save. Thus, being one with the scholar by sharing his life and experience, he is capable in virtue of his priesthood and the unique value which, it is said, his Mass will then possess, of uniting that scholarly world and the Church whose representative he is.⁶

6. Autonomous scholarship has no part, it will be noted, with any of these proposed priestly functions—not with respect to the layman, whom the priest is called upon to help to the integration of all levels of knowledge not merely among themselves but with an intense spirituality; not with respect to the non-Catholic, whom the scholar cannot meet on religious grounds save through something extrinsic to his scholarship.

Though they contain much truth, such arguments are not in themselves conclusive. Firstly, they do not answer the problem posed. What they say of the Church's task is true; but not every task of the Church is a task for the priest. In these days of highly-educated brothers and nuns, some convincing answer must be given to the question why these tasks within the Church should not be given to dedicated laymen as, with time, they become fully capable of exercising them, in order to leave the priests free for their distinctive functions. Why should priests who are already in scholarly work not seek to form lay scholars of a sufficiently vigorous spirituality to be their replacements? Nor should one forget the possibility of deacons being devoted to scholarly pursuits. Moreover, those outside the Church can, for the most part, best be reached by laymen. Most of modern Catholic Action is built precisely on this foundation, that the layman can penetrate easily into places no priest can reach. And all through the Church's history, missionary priests have, after the example of St. Paul, surrounded themselves with chosen laymen who, with them or, often, in advance of them, served to bring non-Catholics into living contact with the Church and then, as catechists, prepared the way for or followed up the priest's official instruction and sacramental action.

Secondly, it is an open question to what extent scholars really desire creative scholarship in the priest. Certainly they demand comprehension and intelligent openness; but often enough those who are Catholics feel the presence of the priest as a somewhat baffling intrusion, not so much of the sacred into the temporal as of the ecclesiastical into the secular, somewhat as American Catholics tend to regard a priest's entrance into politics. If the scholar is non-Catholic, this sense of intrusion is not infrequently complicated by obscure fears, a feeling that he is being pursued by the Church or that the Church is trying to "take over" his field or whatever other fears his religious or irreligious background may have associated with this Jungian archetype working at his elbow. Laymen, still more non-Catholics, are the last to accept the notion of an autonomous scholarship. The priest remains such always; and by his entrance into a field which they regard as somehow alien to his calling he often becomes an object of suspicion. On the other hand, a priest will generally find it easier to be genuinely interested in another man's work as *his*, as the expression of his person, as a means of understanding him and his

field in love if the priest himself is not forced to regard scholarly results largely through professional eyes. There are other characteristic difficulties also; but we do not wish to exaggerate — there are advantages as well. But the difficulties proper to the priest's efforts indicate, we feel, a problem that cannot be lightly dismissed.

Thirdly, each of the above arguments for priestly scholars could, with but slight change, be applied with equal validity to the political and economic orders, to prove a perennial need for priests engaged in politics and for priestly business-men. From this observation, it is not hard to arrive at the basic difficulty of these arguments: it is not evident that the oneness of a priest with those to whom he is sent need be a oneness of shared experience.

Certainly his oneness with them through charity must go far enough that he love and esteem their work, primarily because he loves them, secondarily because, through that love, he sees with their eyes the intrinsic value and worth of what they are achieving or striving to achieve in the world. This requires, ordinarily, in the case of a mission to a group of scholars, that the priest have a sufficiently broad education and deep enough intellectual sympathies to be able to hear with interest and to grasp with the understanding of an open and cultivated mind the significance of the things they tell him of their labors and aspirations. Evidently, too, the longer and closer his experience with his group on this level of love and intentionality, the richer and more profound his contact with them is likely to be. But this intentional experience is quite a different matter from being a creative scholar himself.

It is important, consequently, to distinguish carefully the professional competence of the scholar (his ability to contribute directly and creatively to some field of knowledge) from a merely vicarious, even if extensive, knowledge of major results, problems, and methods in that field, which general knowledge, when personally assimilated and vivified by inner understanding, can be designated simply as "learning."⁷

7. Thus, a priest needs to know his theology; but for all that he need not be a professional theologian. And though theology is continuous with all parts of human knowledge, even the professional theologian will not ordinarily need scholarly competence in these other fields. The results of scholarship can be used by others than those capable of discovering them.

This distinction, however, is not a barrier. Though the goals of learning and scholarship are quite different and correspond generally to different psychological situations and types of personality, still a man of great learning and a certain creative bent can, for example, hardly keep from scholarship if confronted with urgent problems for which he finds at hand no solutions; and scholarship, in turn, can be made an excellent means of acquiring depth of learning.

C. Priests and Learning There is, however, an intrinsic connection between the priesthood and learning, if not with scholarship. One of the distinctively priestly functions is official proclamation of the Faith, what might be called kerygma in a large sense. Now, as has been made increasingly clear in recent times, not merely is there a heavy theological content in the four Gospels but also in the kerygma itself taken in the strictest sense of the term.⁸ From the beginning, then, the Good News has been preached in terms of one theology or another.

This link between theology and kerygma is not simply historical accident. It is rooted in the fact the "proclamation," of no matter what subject matter, is a subdivision of human communication; always implied is the necessity of human understanding and comprehension, by both parties, of the content of the message.⁹

Moreover, an adequate transmission of the message cannot be taken for granted simply on the basis of good will, solid virtue, and grace. Faith does not, without miracle, supplement for understanding, as witness the countless devout distortions of the Gospel, most of them, perhaps, insignificant but many of them material heresy. Think what a collection of untenable doctrine one could cull from the writings of saints, to go no further afield, or how ignorance of essential symbolism has led to invalidity of some sacraments in groups split off from the Church in controversy over quite other matters. Grace does not, in general, compensate for defects of knowledge, culture, health. . . in brief, the natural, save subjectively, though it may provide the means to surmount them.

For every Christian there will be, then, as a consequence of his duty to live his faith and to spread it, some suitable or fitting degree of intellectual development and learning. This suitability will be determined partly by his natural abilities and the culture to which he belongs, and partly by the concrete circumstances of his life and by his position, functions, and duties within society.¹⁰

A fortiori, those who are officially constituted for the communication of the Gospel must possess a learning commensurate

8. Cf., for example, C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures—The Substructure of New Testament Theology*, Digswell Place, (1952).

9. This element of communication is to be found not only in the priest's kerygmatic function but in all his characteristic activities. For example, there can be no government without communication, nor wise government without two-way communication; and the means of sanctification, the Mass and Sacraments, have their very existence as signs and symbols.

10. There are two chief simplistic errors in this matter: *pietism*, which defines suitability too contingently in terms only of the conditions of a man's life and his relations to society, usually taken in an

with their task. Since as human cultures grow and develop, the exigencies of communication do likewise, this learning, in both quantity and quality, will vary greatly from place to place and from one century to another. If, then, one takes "learned" and "ignorant" not absolutely but with respect to the environing culture, the ignorant priest is, in this aspect at least, a poor priest; and an ignorant clergy in a well-educated milieu, whether lay or non-Catholic, leads quickly to an intolerable situation for the Church, whatever extraordinary effects certain great saints may have had.¹¹ Church history offers all too numerous examples of the unfortunate effects of even saintly priests' meddling in matters beyond their competence. St. John Chrysostom's dictum that monks should not be made bishops because of their ignorance of the ways of men has force not only for bishops but for all priests in an active life.

It is into this context of suitable knowledge that the question of a priest's mission enters. The priest who is a Carthusian needs only that learning which is suitable for him as an individual, though should he undertake spiritual direction or writing for others, he becomes at once responsible for a good deal more. The priest who is to work among men must have a sympathetic knowledge of much that is profane. The pattern is particularly clear in the case of Penance, whose demands for an integral knowledge of men in their sinfulness and weakness as well as their virtue are responsible for the never-ceasing expansion of moral and pastoral theology. But the same pattern can be found implicit in every priestly activity. Finally, with regard to the basic problem we have been considering, a priest sent among scholars, not unlike his brother on the foreign missions, needs not only a considerable breadth of learning but often a new and technical language, occasionally a new culture.

exclusively religious sense, and even that, often enough, largely in terms of the extraordinary effects of grace; and *humanism*, which defines suitability too absolutely, solely in terms of a man's abilities and the surrounding culture, ignoring or minimizing the complications introduced by sin and the consequent irrational elements in the human condition, especially in its societal aspects. The pietist, then, regards the human communication of the supernatural as supernatural communication; the humanist, as the human communication of a system of theology or even of a system of human values.

11. If a priest's ignorance is not his own fault, personal sanctity may, to some degree, compensate. Since communication is between persons, his love may enable him to transmit what little learning he possesses in a more perfect degree than one who has more to communicate but whose transmitter is filled with personal static. But love does not usually correct errors in the message itself. A good example is offered by the Cure of Ars, whose sanctity was great enough to effect innumerable, often astounding, conversions and yet was insufficient to correct the Jansenist-tainted moral theology which he had been taught in his seminary.

The intrinsic relation of suitable learning to the priesthood is, of course, intrinsic to the priesthood, not to the studies; the exigencies of apostolic communication remain extrinsic motivation in terms of learning as such. Thus there remains a basic difference between the learning of the priest and that of the layman. The difference is not that of two distinct areas of activity but of two distinct directions of motion in that activity. The priest starts from his characteristic powers and moves towards the men to whom he is sent, seeking throughout the whole created order for the means to make those powers of more ready acceptance and greater efficacy. The layman begins rather from the attempt to understand, in the light of his faith, the significance of the temporal order and of his activities therein, laboring to elevate that order in accordance with his vision of faith.

In summary, then, although by no means closed to priests, scholarship is primarily a layman's function. The internal bond uniting the priesthood and learning is insufficient of itself to found the work of scholarly research or non-kerygmatic teaching as intrinsically priestly functions. Nonetheless, the priest is free to engage in scholarship to the extent that his priestly duties permit; and in default of an adequate laity his priesthood itself can at times require such engagement.

III. Religious Life and Scholarship

A. Secular and Religious Spiritualities Short at least of that fulness of priesthood which belongs to the bishop, a man's hierarchical position does not determine his type of spirituality. Priests, deacons, and laymen alike may, in principle, live as seculars or Religious or occupy any point of a continuous spectrum of intermediate conditions.¹²

At one end of the spectrum, secular spirituality helps man to use, develop, and enjoy the temporal order under the action of grace, thus bearing witness that the value given to temporal things by creation has not been diminished but consecrated through Christ's taking up of our human nature — and all else natural in connection with it — in His Incarnation. The man of purely secular spirituality serves the Church by preparing the

¹² We use "secular" in its standard sense, referring to the Catholic who lives in the world, particularly in the married state. The "secular" priest of the Latin rite has, of course, moved some distance from the secular toward the Religious as a result of his vow of celibacy. Evidently, "secular" has nothing here of the pejorative sense of either "secularist" or "worldly."

necessary natural conditions for the spreading of the Kingdom of God.

The spirituality characteristic of a Religious Order, strictly so called, has as its primary aim as direct and immediate a union with God as possible. This union, however, of the sin-stained creature with the Divine Majesty can only take place in and through the redemptive mysteries of our Lord's Passion and Glorification. Renouncing, then, such foundation-stones of the temporal order as possessions, family, and the free disposition of his own activity, the Religious strives to give every element in his life the imprint of Christ's redeeming death in order to share more intensely, now, His risen life. Through this bond with man's Redemption, the Religious state possesses its own form of intrinsic apostolate: the multiple witness which it bears before the world to the possibility and immense desirability of divine union, as well as to the necessity of crucifixion with Christ before men can make an integrally natural use of the temporal order, and to the trifling value of temporal goods insofar as these act concretely as hindrances to our eternal sharing in His glory. It is this witness which forms the core of all Religious apostolate.

Scholarship can be fully compatible with either secular or Religious spirituality, though in different ways. Secular spirituality shows the scholar how his labors can be elevated by grace from within and, building on his awareness of their importance for the temporal order, helps him to find in their intrinsic apostolic value a Christian goal for his effort. The scholarly pursuits of a priest of purely secular spirituality will be limited, of course, by his priestly duties but not by his type of spirituality.

On the other hand, the Religious state as such is perfectly neutral towards scholarship. Religious spirituality need not, of itself, set scholarship aside but does require that it be abandoned volitionally, to be resumed only in entire subordination to the unitive ideal. The intrinsic value of a man's scholarly work or his personal satisfaction in doing it, though determining the potentialities of its usefulness, cease to weigh as motives. What counts is the utility of his work, whether for his union with God or, as a result of that union, for God's greater service and honor.

Consequently, the learning suitable to a Jesuit solely in virtue of his being a Religious would be quite small. This is the chief reason that the education of our Brothers was limited as long as the management of the temporal affairs of the Society offered no

special ground for further studies — for the studies of the scholastics were imposed in view of the learning they would need as priests.

In fact, however, relations of affinity or opposition do exist between scholarship and the specific elements which characterize particular Religious institutes. The Jesuit's relation to scholarship, then, can only be discussed in terms of what is proper to Jesuit spirituality.

B. Jesuit Spirituality For Ignatius and his companions, the defining characteristic of the new Society seems to have been that it should be a Religious Order of "apostolic priests."¹³ They would be Religious in the strongest sense of the term, but would by their very profession as Religious be consecrated totally to the active service of the Universal Church, exercising in her behalf the entire range of distinctively priestly action, though without being limited to that.¹⁴ They placed themselves at the disposition of the Pope in order to be of maximum service. Jesuits are not, then, simply Religious who have superadded a special devotedness to the Pope. Their abnegation, humility, poverty, and all the characteristic virtues through which they are bound by their state to give witness to the world are always to be exercised in that context of papal mission, of maximal service, of meeting the most urgent needs of the Church.

This total adaptation of the Religious state to priestly activity required internal modifications of spirituality even more important than such external changes as the dropping of choir. Ignatius taught his followers how the active life of priestly apostolate could itself be the medium in which the penance, poverty, humiliations, and abnegation, needed according to the Religious tradition for an intense interior life, could be exercised. This intense interior life became, in turn, not merely a preparation for subsequent apostolic action but the latter's simultaneously growing operative principle. Further, though he conceived — as did all orthodox tradition — the manifestation of divine union in terms far less of contemplation than of union of our will with God's, yet he regarded this union

13. Thus the temporal coadjutors were conceived as assistants to the priests in their apostolate, dedicated to any functions necessary for its full impact which would not require priestly powers.

14. Thus the early Jesuits' notion of "apostolic priests" included tending the sick, helping the poor, rescuing prostitutes — all things that are today mostly handled, and rightly so, by laymen. Nor, after all, is there anything exclusively priestly about giving the Spiritual Exercises, all the first companions of Ignatius having made the Exercises at the hands of a layman.

not simply as the doing or the accepting of God's will, once it has been made known, but also as the active search to find His will, when not known, in order to accomplish it fully.

Finally, Ignatius offered Jesuits a new approach to contemplation itself. In the main current of monastic tradition, a man sought to mount by the ladder of created things to the realm of silence beyond all creatures, where he could rest in God. With Ignatius the movement is profoundly different. United through our Lord with the intimate life of the Three Persons, a man's gaze is drawn towards Their presence and activity in creatures, primarily that of Christ through His Spirit in the Church; and, responding to this omnipresent gift, he commits himself to that total self-donation which is the active reception in oneself-as-instrument of the divine activity. Thus, whereas typically monastic contemplation stands in a certain opposition to exterior activity, the Ignatian form tends to convert external activity into an integral element of contemplation, and its continuation.¹⁵

(This is perhaps the place to mention an opinion fairly widespread today among Jesuit scholastics, though more so, apparently, among the Fathers a generation in front of them, that the spirituality of the Society is not fully Religious but is in large measure secular. This opinion seems to be the result of a whole complexus of problems arising from our mode of formation and the manner of life in our scholasticates and universities. Our men have, in fact, been seeking a spirituality which would give apostolic meaning or, at least, justification to the sort of life they lead. This life has been increasingly given over to the profane studies and scholarship needed for our educational activities. Since, however, we have had no well worked out Jesuit spirituality of such study nor much personal formation in the distinctive spirituality of our Institute, we have picked up, more or less ready-made, that spirituality which seemed to fit best with our work as we saw it in the concrete, during the time of our formation as well as later in the universities, with its apparent lack of interest in a direct apostolate, its seeming self-sufficiency and unconcern with

15. The purification of soul and abnegation of self required to make Ignatian contemplation possible is certainly not less than that required of monks; yet, as already mentioned, once beyond its rudimentary stages, this purification is to be sought primarily, though not exclusively, in and through the apostolate and the works which prepare us for it. As to the argument that makes finding God in all things more or less equivalent to secular spirituality, we may simply refer to Ignatius' own practice, as recounted in the *Autobiography*, or to that of Xavier on his terrible journeys. The Jesuit is to find God in poverty, study, humiliations, the labors of his apostolate and all else that enters his life as an apostolic Religious; there is no invitation to leave this austere framework in order to enjoy or taste all things so as to find God in them.

the urgent spiritual needs of the world, its almost rationalistic separation of theology and philosophy from the rest of human knowledge. Anxious to avoid a monastic spirituality which would withdraw us from apostolic contact with the world, we have tried to make our own the spirituality which seeks, by showing the natural value of study, to highlight its intrinsic apostolic worth: the spirituality of the secular scholar. But our basic problems have recurred in force in the face of such a solution. No Jesuit can live happily with a secular spirituality any more than with one that is monastic. This historical process, precisely because it took place independently of any preconceived theories, is one of the strongest proofs, we feel, that our spirituality is fully Religious and that any theory of autonomous scholarship, whatever its value for seculars, is incompatible with our life as Jesuits.)

C. Basis of Jesuit Scholarship In the light of all this, it is clear that, whatever may be the limitations on scholarship for other priests, there are no limitations on that which the Church can ask of the Society's priests whenever her needs cannot be adequately provided for otherwise. Now, today in this country — it would seem in all the world — the Church has incalculable and urgent need of profoundly spiritual, broadly educated, highly competent scholars, both for her own internal vigor and for the greatly neglected apostolate to the non-Catholic intellectual. So also, she has need of schools at the highest levels. The Society, in consequence of its past development and universally apostolic spirituality, has been in the strongest position to meet these needs. Whence the truly amazing system of American Jesuit education and scholarship, which, whatever its flaws, has been one of the most important influences used by God to lead the Church towards maturity in the United States.

But it is also clear that research and teaching are, for us, always a conditioned apostolate. The greatest unmet needs of the Church change concretely from place to place, from period to period. Whence the Society also is, as to its apostolate, essentially in flux and change. Thus, as one example, we have been committed from the beginning to teaching the simplest fundamentals of the catechism to children and the illiterate; but once a country

16. There would seem to be no insurmountable obstacle to admitting well-trained deacons and laymen to the Society as temporal coadjutors who, after an adequate formation in philosophy and theology, would carry on more and more of the work of research and teaching in our universities, as well as of their administration, thus freeing our priests for other tasks.

has numerous congregations of nuns dedicated to this work, it is contrary to our spirit to continue it.

While giving ourselves, then, to the works of scholarship as long as need be, and that with all our hearts and energy, yet we should recognize that the urgency of this need will come to an end well before the need itself for priestly scholars has ceased. Our spirituality will direct us then, as Jesuits, to areas of greater urgency for the Church and, as Religious priests, toward the distinctively priestly works in these areas in which we can live in greater poverty and obscurity. Thus an integral and always essential part of our scholarly apostolates would seem to be the effort to form, by means of the Spiritual Exercises, of professional Sodalities, and of individual action, priests and laymen (whether ultimately part of some Religious community or not) who will be competent, spiritually and intellectually, to take our place on one level of scholarship after another.¹⁶

IV. Apostolic Scholarship

At the beginning of this investigation of the relations of the Jesuit priest to scholarship, we sketched two positions which have served as poles for the theories commonly proposed — the one pole regarding scholarship as a decoy to conceal apostolic intentions; the other favoring autonomous scholarship, subordinated to no apostolate other than its own intrinsic witness to truth. It remained, then, to show that a third position, which we have called apostolic scholarship, is not merely a theoretical possibility but is, in fact, demanded by the very nature of the Jesuit priest's vocation. Disengaged from the various ramifications of the discussion, the essentials of this position can be summarized as follows:

The Jesuit priest to whose lot the task of scholarship falls is to use a full and integral scholarship as an apostolic means for the conversion and spiritual perfecting of men, for the building up of the Church. His work differs from "baiting the hook" in that it is not, as that is, a mere pretense of scholarship. It is full and dedicated study of truth, based on genuine interest in and love of his field, with a strong desire to help in its advancement; nothing less will meet the Church's need. But all this remains subordinated to directly apostolic ends.¹⁷

17. The difficulty is often raised that such subordination would, in the concrete, destroy the possibility of true scholarship: apostolic needs are so great that, instead of spending his time on his research and

(Continued on Next Page)

It is this subordination which provides the "point of insertion" for the Papal mandate, mediated through the General, which alone can send Jesuits into scholarly work. Jesuit spirituality, Religious in the strongest sense of the term, finding God in all things directly and immediately from above, not mediately through creatures from below, is fully adequate for such an apostolate; but, precisely as Religious, it demands the continued abnegation of the desire to establish ourselves in the scholarly life in the manner proper to seculars. As Jesuits, we are never free to undertake or continue scholarly endeavors purely for their own intrinsic value, but only in relation to the most urgent apostolic needs of the Church. Finally, since scholarship is primarily the layman's task, part of our job is to prepare laymen, our Brothers or others, to replace us.

Two examples of missionary adaptation may show more clearly the import of apostolic scholarship. Consider first de' Nobili's work in South Indian language and culture. His vision of the needs of this mission led him to seek a mandate to its highest caste. His love for Christ gave him, with this mandate, a special love for these people and their cultural achievements. He wished both people and culture brought wholly under the yoke of Christ; and, just because he did so, he was able so to immerse himself in their culture as to be able to contribute to it creatively himself. But his apostolic intention was always operative; whence, for example, he missed no opportunity to bring about conversions when these could be achieved without imperilling his whole project.

On the other hand, the Baghdad mission today illustrates the reason why many Jesuits have been engaged seemingly in autonomous scholarship though actually in that subordinated to a direct apostolate. There, any conversions to Catholicism among the non-Christians attending our schools would bring instant expulsion of the missionaries. Thus, the conditions of the particular apostolate

writing, the scholar would be "on supply" constantly and never have time to produce anything of real value. This difficulty overlooks the significance of the priestly scholar's mission. His mission defines for him the range of his apostolate. His scholarship is subordinated to certain apostolic ends only, not to all. The fact that he is a priest demands, we believe, that he refuse no one who comes to him; but his mandate requires that he make reasonable efforts to avoid having any but those of his mission come to him. Evidently, the determination of the exact limits of his mandate must in practice be left by Superiors in large measure to the individual, since these limits are in part functions of the man's own personality and needs, the nature of his field of action and its interior dynamism, the concrete circumstances, and the call of God's grace at the given moment. The position taken here imposes no rigid criteria for the acceptance or exclusion of pastoral ministries by a Jesuit scholar.

It is also argued that apostolic subordination would restrict the Jesuit scholar to "practical" research, to questions of narrow apologetics or those useful in the short range only — which would be the death of real scholarship. The response seems evident: to whatever extent such restriction is a hindrance to true scholarship, apostolic subordination requires the rejection of such "practical" research and the pursuit of that which is more basic though less immediately fruitful.

itself force the apostolic aim of the work into obscurity; but as soon as circumstances would permit, more directly apostolic efforts would be made.

It is not by mere chance that our apostolate of scholarship can be clarified by examples drawn from the foreign missions. The Jesuit scholar's work is essentially the same as that of the Jesuit missionary. Both, generally, spend much of their time doing things which, ideally, could be left to a well-trained laity. Both draw their courage for and the value of such work from the Church's mandate. They are sent, each to some section of mankind which lies, to some extent, outside their own language, culture, and patterns of thought. The comprehension of, adjustment to, and penetration by personal relationships into their flock may well require that many of them labor all their lives in silence, preparing the ground so that others can harvest the apostolic fruit. What is important is that they regard such work for what it is: it is not priestly work because of its intrinsic nature but because of the necessities of the Church which demand that it be done; it is the work of Religious, not in itself but through the specifically Jesuit spirituality into which it is received and because of the mandate of the Church which sends her Jesuits to meet her needs whether there be well-formed seculars to help them or not.

V. Applications

The position taken here in favor of apostolic as against autonomous scholarship will affect considerably the evaluation of our universities.¹⁸ Consider the three main functions served by post-baccalaureate programs in the United States today: the training of teachers; the staffing of the professions; research and the advancement of knowledge.

In all three areas, it is quite generally thought that the Church in America today needs, above all, people who are well-trained in their fields, of vigorous and creative mentality, free of a "ghetto" outlook in their dealings with the non-Catholic world, and sound in faith and morals, but who are, beyond all this, real leaders, with a strong social consciousness and a profound desire to serve the Church by taking an active, where possible a decisive, part in the various social processes which are continually

18. We use the term "university" to designate only those parts or aspects of our schools which aim at degrees beyond the baccalaureate.

at work in their fields of competence to form the patterns of American morality and culture. As leaders of the Catholic intellectual and professional community, they would have special need of a deep interior life, oriented towards action, and of saturation with Catholic thought, not merely that of the past nor solely that which is explicitly theological and philosophical, but the full, living tradition of the Church, in all its varied achievements and in its desires for the future.

With regard more particularly to research and the advancement of knowledge, there is a tremendous and ever-increasing need today of high-level research in areas where only Catholics are likely, in the concrete, to do an adequate job. These include those areas where the Church is now being attacked or where solid work now can forestall attack, those also which are of great potential benefit to the entire Church in her apostolate, and those which are needed for a full flowering of Catholic thought. This aspect of our apostolate seems so greatly neglected that we append below a few samples at random of the sort of thing we have in mind.¹⁹ There are dozens of others. If these are not dealt with by Jesuits, at least until such time as the laity is prepared and eager for such work, one may well ask who will deal with them. They would require, for the most part, the cooperative efforts of many people, over a long period, in a university which would regard such research as one of its primary reasons for being.

Evidently, a university dedicated to the carrying on of such research and to the spiritual and intellectual formation of Catholic leaders could only have apostolic scholarship as its justification and its goal.²⁰

19. (a) Investigation of purportedly miraculous cures, by Jesuits set aside entirely for this work, each with an M.D., a Ph.D. in psychiatry or abnormal psychology, and special background in theology and philosophy. Their task would include the compilation, publication, and analysis of complete case-records; they would seek to stimulate needed improvements of controls and dossiers at Lourdes and elsewhere; they would continue the scrutiny and development of adequate criteria for the discernment of miraculous from non-miraculous medical and psychological prodigies. The value of such work for the apologist, philosopher, or theologian is immediately evident.

(b) Empirical investigation of the socially destructive effects of abortion, contraceptives, divorce, AIH and AID, etc., as well as their effects, statistically speaking, on the individual. Such investigations should provide natural-law theory with plentiful factual support and furnish, as well, abundant new insights and modes of understanding for these problems.

(c) Careful and detailed studies of the effects of Catholicism (Protestantism, Judaism, atheism. . .) on war, religious persecution, intellectual narrowness, political ideals, respect of the human person, etc.

(d) An Institute for the study of the physico-chemical bases of living processes (including researches in structural chemistry, irreversible thermodynamics, systems and communication theory, stochastic theory, etc.) ordered to the discussion and investigation of the philosophical implications of the experimental and theoretical findings.

20. On the practical order, whatever the absolute size of such a school, it would require a highly select student body and a largely Jesuit faculty. The latter would, for this level of research and teaching, have to be maintained by stable cooperation among several Provinces. Excellent treatment of this "specifically Jesuit university," as well as of the "large, complex university," soon to be mentioned, is given in:

Since the Church in the United States would seem to need at least one such university more than perhaps anything else whatever and since the Society is, in virtue of its spirit, its training, and the express desires of the Popes, in a far better position to provide such a school than any others, we would really seem obliged to do so. Even this sort of university would, of course, be *our* apostolate only conditionally. But it is more than unlikely that this generation will be faced with any problems in regard to these schools beyond that of getting one or two established and well-functioning.

In recent years, however, it has been urged increasingly that our universities conform instead to the norms of autonomous scholarship. Thus, only in parts of theology and perhaps of philosophy would the teaching or research show itself different from that found in a good non-Catholic university. Governed primarily by an ideal of scholarship, such a school would in practice have a steadily expanding structure, striving for the maximum range of facilities, graduate programs, and professional schools — hence the name “large, complex university” sometimes applied to it. The faculty would be composed mostly of secular laymen, though without barriers to non-Catholics or non-Christians. A large and growing student body would be desired, even if the majority had only mediocre intellectual and spiritual interests.²¹

Robert F. Harvanek, S.J., “The Objectives of the American Jesuit University—A Dilemma,” *J.E.Q.*, XXIV, 69 (1961); C. Edward Gilpatric, S.J., “The Role of the Jesuit University,” *J.E.Q.*, XXV, 210 (1963); and Fr. Harvanek’s immediately following “Comment” on this latter.

21. It is quite true of course, that some who favor a large, complex university have little or no sympathy with autonomous scholarship. Their position is that: a) the large, complex university is necessary to provide as many ordinary, educated Catholics as possible with Catholic principles of thought and action, to give them a Catholic atmosphere in which to begin their professional life, and to protect them from non-Catholic poisoning; b) the large, complex university achieves the same purposes as the “specifically Jesuit” one through the action of its Jesuits not directly on the student body but on the rest of the faculty; c) the large, complex university can offer the advantages of the specifically Jesuit one to any advanced students who are at once competent and desirous of such intense formation.

Taken in general, this position bears greater resemblance to “baiting the hook” than to a serious appreciation of possible functions of a university. In detail, c) would hold, at best, for graduate students working for a doctorate in close contact with a Jesuit director, but hardly for those in the professional schools. Even in the former case it seems unlikely, since the majority of the faculty would not be Jesuit — often, not even Catholic. If b) is held seriously, then it approaches the notion of apostolic scholarship — but then there are more efficient and effective ways of producing such a lay elite. As to a), one may well question how significantly our professional or graduate schools, even now, contribute to a life according to Catholic principles over and above what the student brings with him to his advanced studies from his college days. There is something to be said for the position — as many a Newman Club chaplain would gladly testify — that one gets better Catholics by formation in a Catholic college followed by attendance at a non-Catholic graduate or professional school than by their remaining all the time under Catholic auspices as now constituted. One should not ignore the intense Catholic life to be found to an ever-increasing extent in connection with most non-Catholic graduate schools (for those who want it) and the worldly or indifferent mentality to be found all too often in Catholic ones (for those not interested in something better). As to the question of protection, once the student has left college, if he is not capable of attending a non-Catholic graduate school without notable danger, the Catholic college has failed in its purpose (or the student failed to benefit). There is not much evidence to show that the business world, which most of our college graduates enter, is markedly less perilous to the soul than a good, non-Catholic graduate school.

Just because of their grounding in autonomous scholarship, however, large, complex universities are properly the business of the secular layman; they are not for the Society. They may be good things; but to whatever extent they are needed, they can be run by non-Jesuits. One may note that the present trend towards the laicization of our universities seems to go hand in hand with the trend towards making them large, complex universities. It should not, then, be impossible for us to dissociate ourselves totally from such schools, turning them over entirely to the laity, and to devote our full energies to the type of school which only the Society, at present, can handle adequately.

But scholarship can be the instrument of other apostolates than those of our universities. Once granted, then, the apostolic nature of Jesuit scholarship, a certain rethinking of the optimal use of our scholarly resources may be necessary. It would seem proper to weigh in the same balance, for example, the apostolic influence of our universities and that which could be had by Jesuits who would teach and do research as members of the graduate faculties, whether of theology or of profane subjects, in the better non-Catholic universities. The close personal contact which could be had between these Jesuits and their non-Catholic colleagues could well be a most effective way, until such time as the laity arrives in greater force, of bringing the non-Catholic scholar into sympathetic understanding and acceptance of the Church. The Jesuits themselves would certainly be enriched from such contact; and their acquisition of the latest and, hopefully, the best of non-Catholic thought might well serve, through some plan of rotation, as a major source of apostolic and academic stimulation for our own universities. And few other apostolates, perhaps, would better establish in the eyes of all Americans the compatibility and sympathy between the Church and scholarship. That such an apostolate would have its dangers for the Jesuits involved goes without saying; the dangers are, however, of the sort which Ignatius intended his men should be formed to meet.

Apostolic scholarship has certain consequences also for the thorny problem of our poverty. It is not by accident that this problem is felt most acutely in connection with our life in universities and colleges; from the days of Ignatius onwards, it has been the operating of schools that has affected most drastically the First Companions' vision of our poverty. Three spiritual

attitudes developed in response to this alteration which have not ceased to manifest themselves up to the present. One attitude, rightly insisting that the Society's spirituality is fully and profoundly Religious, would limit or even abolish apostolates such as our universities, in large measure on the grounds that they cannot co-exist with the poverty envisaged by our Institute and, hence, must be, at root, incompatible with our vocation. Another attitude, rightly believing that the spirituality of the Society cannot be divorced from the apostolate given us by the Church, would let our poverty, so to speak, take care of itself and, in consequence of the partly secular spirituality supposedly required by scholarship, would tend to regard our poverty as a type of balanced moderation, avoiding both the excess of luxury and the austerity of want.

The notion of apostolic scholarship gives support, however, to the third attitude. Recognizing that it is the element of mandate in our apostolate rather than its particular content that is the determining and formal factor in our spirituality, the Society should, on this view, feel no hesitation in continuing its various scholarly apostolates, adapting its methods of financing them to the economic and social situations in which they are to be carried on. Yet, aware that these scholarly apostolates are apostolates "by default," the Society would work steadily at the preparation of its priestly and lay replacements and, regarding actual poverty as one of the most powerful of apostolic tools, would employ it with the same quiet and persevering zeal as that which is characteristic of our research and teaching.

A Blind Student - Why Not?

By Edward T. Ruch*

Have you ever been called upon to determine the eligibility of a visually handicapped individual for admission to your school? This can be a difficult decision to make, especially if you are not adequately equipped with a prior knowledge of the scholastic and personal achievements of blind and partially seeing students. As you may know, the integration of a visually disabled pupil in a sighted setting is not a new concept in academic circles. In 1965 there were approximately 19,000 high school and 2,000 college and postgraduate blind students enrolled in public and private school systems throughout the country. This latter figure is constantly changing from year to year as additional schools of higher learning are opening their doors for the first time to the blind student. The academic record compares favorably with that of their sighted counterparts. It is evident from these figures that you are not alone in having to judge the scholastic capabilities of visually handicapped students.

How Can the School Administration Cooperate?

We have compiled a series of typical questions that could occur to the interviewee of a prospective blind student. The answers to these questions are recommended for your consideration as an addition to your current knowledge of the visually handicapped.

Perhaps the most significant factors in the successful participation of a visually handicapped student in an integrated school program are the cooperation of:

- a) The school administration and faculty
- b) The student body
- c) The blind student himself

We realize that sighted as well as visually handicapped candidates are not always qualified to meet the standards of a given school. Since this decision can alter the future vocational course of a student's life, especially in the case of the handicapped, we recommend that the administrator be objective in his views. Look

* Director of Educational Services, Xavier Society for the Blind,
154 E. 23rd St., New York, N.Y. 10010

upon the blind applicant first as a student and assess his qualifications accordingly. If he meets your standard, then turn to the matter of recognizing and solving the problems that may arise in his participation as a visually handicapped member of the student body.

In order that those teachers directly associated with the blind student may better understand how they are to cooperate with him, it is recommended that the administrator arrange a meeting to answer questions and orient the teachers in procedures to be followed. If appropriate professional personnel is available, either through a local diocesan special education office or a similar public school program, a representative could be requested to advise those in attendance in any technical areas of concern that may be present.

How Can the Faculty Cooperate?

Next to the administration, the teachers are the most important officials in relation to the blind student. The proper attitude and understanding of the teacher is essential, for he is the closest authority to the handicapped pupil and is called upon to make the greatest adjustment of "normal" practice to accommodate the student as a sightless member of his sighted class.

The teacher will be contacted by the visually handicapped student or a representative of a special education or transcription program before classes begin for the name or actual textbook used in the course. It is imperative that this information be given as early as possible so that the search for *transcribed* editions of ink-print books can be started. If it is necessary to prepare any of the required titles for the special use of the handicapped student, several months will be necessary to complete the work.

In an effort to utilize existing resources, the Xavier Society for the Blind has established a Central Index of textbook information. This register is concerned with textbooks that have been transcribed into braille, large type and recorded form for the use of visually handicapped students attending classes on the elementary, secondary and college levels in Catholic schools throughout the United States. The Index operates on a request-referral basis and is designed to put those students needing textbooks in touch with sources where they are deposited.

If necessary titles are not made available, the student and the

teacher will suffer an unnecessary handicap. Therefore, you can see the importance of an accurate and early book list.

Every effort should be made to help sighted students understand that the visually handicapped classmate is a fellow student with a disability and not an object of curiosity. Sighted students sometimes have a tendency to shy away from or ignore the blind member of the class. This reaction is not malicious but rather an indication that they are uneasy simply because they do not know what to do. After the instructor has been properly informed it is important that the class should be oriented as well. This explanation should be made by the instructor. He can therefore indicate his acceptance and attitude of cooperation and consequently provide example to his students.

Cooperation on the Part of the Blind Student

In order that the blind student may function effectively as a member of the sighted class it is necessary for him to make certain adaptations in routine classroom procedures.

Taking Notes

Most courses of study, especially on a college level, require that the student take notes. This procedure is accomplished by the handicapped student in a variety of ways. Some blind individuals are more proficient in the use of braille than others. These pupils prefer to take their own notes either with a slate and stylus or braille writer. As a student advances through the grades, he may find that the use of portable disc or tape recorders in combination with braille is a more practical system for his particular use. On the secondary level the cooperation of a sighted member of the class in making carbon copies of notes together with braille notes and/or sheer memory is most effective.

One of the most useful talents that must be learned by the visually impaired student is the art of "how to listen." A student can retain important points of information long enough to record them when the class session has been terminated. A good memory, then, is an invaluable tool.

Taking Examinations

A method for the administering and taking of examinations is often one of the more difficult problems to be resolved. It is

usually impractical for a quiz or a more formidable test to be conducted when and where it is being administered to the class. Therefore, special arrangements are to be made for a blind student. It should first be administered if the student can use a typewriter. If this is the case the student could submit his answers in typewritten form and, therefore, could take the examination at the time it is being administered to the rest of the students. Questions would have to be dictated orally or the student would be provided with a brailled copy of the questions. Of course, the test would have to be done at a location other than the classroom. If the student cannot use a typewriter it would be necessary to have it dictated and the answers entered by a sighted monitor. Another approach would be for the teacher to arrange a special appointment before, during or after school to administer the test personally and judge the student's answers as they are given.

In view of the extra time involved in each of these adaptations it is advisable to relax or eliminate time limits and concentrate primarily on the student's ability to answer the questions. If the alternative of brailled questions and typewritten or verbal answers is to be used, it would be helpful to investigate the possibility of transcription services in the area that could prepare examinations ahead of time. If the school is not cognizant of such facilities, perhaps the student would know where transcribers can be found. This system would be most applicable in the case of final examinations and tests of similar importance.

It is usually the practice of secondary programs to conduct periodic or spontaneous psychometric tests of their student body. It is unnecessary to restrict the blind student from such exercises, since several such test batteries are already available in braille or recorded form; for example, College Board Examinations, and a variety of tests under the headings of Diagnostic Reading Tests, Standardized Oral Reading Paragraphs and Stanford Achievement Tests. If the particular test being used is not already in transcribed form, perhaps its equivalent could be located. If either of these alternatives is not possible, permission can be sought from the publisher of the desired examination and it would then be prepared in the form most useful for the student. Here again; local transcription services will be necessary.

It is important that the visually handicapped student be evaluated along with his sighted counterparts for school records and,

even more significant, to further demonstrate his identity with the rest of the student body.

How He Studies

There are certain parallels in study methods that are common in secondary and advanced education. The reader, a sighted assistant, is one of the most valuable aids to the visually handicapped student. This service is important in high school and essential in college and postgraduate schools. The required material to be read in advanced education and the rapid introduction of new titles make it almost impossible for a blind college student to have transcribed editions of textbooks as readily available to him as they are to his sighted counterparts. To compensate for this loss, it is necessary for the sightless student to rely upon seeing classmates to function as readers.

Usually he will have the services of one main reader and a number of volunteers from his various classes to provide the most complete coverage of subject matter. It is important that this assistant should be familiar with as many of the subjects as possible and that he be in a class ahead of the blind student. If this combination of advantages can be found in one reader, he will be even more valuable to the student.

The selection of this individual can be enhanced through the cooperation of the school administration and/or teaching faculty directly associated with the blind student. Possible ways to find the "right person" for this position would be through outlets such as self-help services of the school, announcements posted in dormitories or other student centers, campus publications and recommendations of other visually handicapped students who may be members of the same student body.

In secondary schools pupils with sufficient academic qualifications function in the "buddy" system as readers. A student doing this work is often rewarded for his efforts by receiving extra credits for his class standing or graduation.

A variety of special devices characteristic of a blind student are used for study purposes. For example, braille writers, tape recorders, Talking Book machines, special mathematical aids, raised maps and typewriters are some of the articles utilized by the blind student. The greater majority of these pieces of equipment are not used on school premises but rather at home.

Other than a comparative few deviations in "normal" study

practices, the visually handicapped student prepares his lessons in much the same manner as classmates. In place of inkprint materials the blind or partially seeing student uses texts that have been transcribed into braille, large type or recorded form.

Through the efficient use of these special devices and services together with the help of sighted persons at home or in school, the student is expected to be prepared as well as any of his sighted classmates to meet the academic requirements of all of his courses of study. It has been demonstrated many times over that the extra effort of the visually handicapped individual together with his scholastic ability have resulted in his being in the upper ranks of his class and, therefore, a credit to his school.

Classroom Procedure

There are comparatively few differences that should be met by the instructor in the integration of the blind student in his class. Blackboard demonstration and the administering of examinations are perhaps the most notable of these.

Blackboard work can be interpreted to the blind student with the least effort on the part of the teacher providing that he will describe illustrations in greater detail as they are placed upon the board. An occasional inquiry of the visually handicapped student by the teacher would be helpful, especially if an illustration is complex. If this is not possible, a fellow student could be appointed to explain the same illustration while it is being done by the teacher. Another alternative would be to provide the student with a previously prepared copy of blackboard exercises. This latter suggestion, together with student's concentration and memory could be sufficient for his understanding of blackboard descriptions.

If the teacher requires that textbooks be used in classroom exercises in subjects such as English, Mathematics and History, it is also possible for the blind student to take part. Of course, much depends upon the availability of adequate transcribed texts for this purpose. He should be called upon in his proper turn to read or answer questions in the same manner as his sighted classmates. Sometimes the only transcribed edition of a textbook is in recorded form. Therefore, its use in class is most impractical. If the teacher could provide the student with prior knowledge of subject matter to be covered on the following class day, the work

can be read at home and the student, being aware of the subject matter, will be prepared to answer questions along with the rest of his class.

Technical subjects such as Laboratory work in Chemistry, Physics and Biology can present problems. For example, it is not possible for the blind student to perform exercises with a microscope. However, this work is usually done on a team basis and the blind student can be the other half of the team. Reproductions of experiments used in Biology and Zoology laboratory courses are also available on a commercial basis and could be used to demonstrate aspects of a given experiment to a blind student.

There are undoubtedly many other potential problems that would arise in the day to day classroom life of a blind student among sighted students that are not covered here. However, if an atmosphere of sincere cooperation by both student and teacher can be developed, very few situations will be left unresolved.

Mobility

A natural question that could occur to the interviewee in considering a visually handicapped candidate is independent mobility. There are three primary methods of travel that are in use today. All three can be used in the school setting. Administrators of secondary programs often appoint capable and responsible students to function as companions or "buddies" to blind students. This assistant is usually a student that has the same classes in common with the visually handicapped pupil. If there is no other alternative, a sighted companion can also be used on the college level. However, this is discouraged in favor of independent mobility.

The use of a cane is common on all levels of education.

Perhaps the most publicized of independent mobility is the use of a guide dog. This approach is infrequent on the high school level. However, it is not uncommon to find a blind person and his guide dog on college and postgraduate campuses.

Here again, the training for independent mobility is the responsibility of the student and not the school. Before the student matriculates, these personal achievements together with others designated in this article should be mastered by him.

In view of the independent movements of the visually handicapped student, the school administrator may question the attitude of the insurance company. It has been the experience of the

school programs already having blind students enrolled that insurance rates do not rise as a result of a blind student being added to the student body. If there is any question in the mind of the interviewee, it is recommended that he be in touch with the company covering his particular school for more detail on this matter.

Extracurricular Activity

The student should be encouraged to join in extracurricular activities providing that they do not interfere with his studies. It is important that he have the opportunity to meet with sighted classmates outside of the classroom atmosphere. The true test of an integrated program is when the sighted students accept the visually handicapped individual on a voluntary basis and include him in their ranks as "one of the boys." Activities such as glee club, debating societies, school publications and sports such as wrestling and tumbling are some of the experiences that have been enjoyed by other visually handicapped pupils.

Should Curriculum Be Changed Because of Blindness?

The advances of visually handicapped persons in the field of education and the development and improvement of methods and materials for their use in the classroom make the study of previously unapproachable subjects possible for the blind student. The school administrator and teaching staff should keep in mind that the student is participating in a setting that is geared for sighted students and that he should adapt, within reason, to the system rather than expect the school program to be altered to fit his particular needs. We must first determine the blind student's individual abilities from an academic as well as resourceful standpoint. Naturally, he will be able to cope with subjects such as English, Social Studies, Economics and Religion, since they are primarily literary courses and, therefore, can be made available in transcribed form. Technical subjects such as Mathematics, Languages and in particular laboratory courses, pose more of a problem from a practical standpoint. Mathematics and languages are almost as accessible as the literary courses. However, there are certain restrictions imposed in lab courses that were described in the section on Classroom Procedure.

All of these subjects have been mastered by other visually

handicapped students. Therefore, there are very few courses of study that should be automatically declared "off limits" to a blind student simply because he is visually handicapped.

What Public Funds Are Available for the Education of the Visually Handicapped?

The cost of education, particularly on the college level, is often prohibitive for sighted as well as sightless students. To make this factor even more pertinent, we must realize that there are certain educational items and services that are necessary for the special use of the blind student.

Aside from the private scholarships that are open to all students, public appropriations have been made to benefit the visually handicapped. For example, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation Service is the governmental agency that has been designated for the disbursement of these funds. If a student cannot afford the cost of his education and meets the requirements of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service, he can receive complete or partial financial aid. Items such as tuition, room and board, reader service and special equipment and materials could be included in this compensation.

Most states provide reader service to qualified blind students. In some instances readers are paid for on a high school level through the Vocational Rehabilitation Service. However, this is not the rule.

Transportation on a secondary level is often provided through public funds for visually impaired students in private schools. This service is not consistent throughout the country, and it is recommended that the local Board of Education be consulted for further information.

Special help such as itinerant teaching facilities or special education consultation should be available through private or public programs. Further details on this service can be obtained through the local diocesan special education program or the public school equivalent.

At this time it is questionable how helpful the recent Federal Aid to Education legislation will be to blind students enrolled in private schools. However, we trust that these funds will provide educational benefits to our visually handicapped.

It is true that the education of visually handicapped persons

requires adaptation of normal procedure on the part of the educator and his staff. We might ask ourselves: Is the result of this work worth the effort?

We all have a right, whether handicapped or not, to develop our God-given potential. In today's world, an education is the means to this end. Today blind persons are active in a variety of vocations such as lawyers, salesmen, doctors, engineers, as well as the religious life. These professionals have demonstrated beyond a doubt their ability to meet the challenge and competition that their professions demand. The *least* then that Catholic educators can do is to extend this opportunity to more and more qualified visually handicapped individuals to earn the education that will make it possible for them to join this ever-growing number.

News from the Field

DIRECTORY CHANGES: Some of the following changes in the forthcoming 1965-1966 JEA Directory may be of interest to the JEQ readers: New Provincials—Very Reverend Walter L. Farrell, S.J. is new Provincial of the Detroit Province. Very Reverend John H. Edwards, S.J. is the new Provincial of the New Orleans Province. The Provincial's residence of the Buffalo Province has moved to: 420 Demong Drive., Syracuse, N.Y. 13214 — Tel. (315) 446-3151. The Reverend James J. Hennesey, S.J. is the new Socius to the Provincial of the New York Province. The Reverend John J. Kindall, S.J. is the new Socius of the Oregon Province.

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS: Reverend Leo L. McLaughlin, S.J. is the new President of Fordham University. Reverend Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J. is the new President of St. Peter's College. Reverend Aloysius C. Galvin is the new President of the University of Scranton.

HOUSES OF STUDIES: Reverend Joseph J. De Vault, S.J. is the Dean of the Theologate at Bellarmine School of Theology, North Aurora. Reverend Joseph A. Devenny, S.J. is Dean of the Theologate at Weston. Reverend Garth L. Hallett, S.J. is Dean of the Philosophate at Assumption Hall, Mobile.

IN THE JUNIORATES: Reverend Thomas E. Porter, S.J. is Dean at Colombiere College. Reverend Joseph S. Pendergast, S.J. is the new Dean at Milford Novitiate. Reverend James R. Draper, S.J. is the new Dean at Sacred Heart Novitiate at Los Gatos.

HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS: There have been several changes in High School Principals for the current year: Reverend Joseph M. Costa, S.J. is the new Principal at Bellarmine Prep., San Jose. Reverend Justin H. Seipp, S.J. is new Principal at Bellarmine High, Tacoma. Reverend Francis J. Dougherty, S.J. is the new Rector and Headmaster at Bishop's Latin School. Reverend Thomas J. Spillane is the new Principal at the Cranwell School. Reverend Alfred E. Morris, S.J. is the new Principal at Fairfield College Preparatory. Reverend C. A. Leining, S.J. is the new Principal of Jesuit High, New Orleans. Reverend Richard M.

Seaver, S.J. is the new Principal at Jesuit High, Portland. Reverend Joseph F. Meehan, S.J. is the new Principal at Jesuit High, Sacramento. Reverend Roy E. Schilling, S.J. is the new Principal at Jesuit High, Shreveport. Reverend John P. Beall, S.J. is the new Principal at Loyola Academy. Reverend John H. Reinke, S.J., former Principal at Loyola Academy is now the new Rector at the Academy. Reverend Charles P. Costello, S.J. is new Principal of Loyola High, Towson. Reverend Paul J. LeBlanc, S.J. is new Principal of Loyola High, Missoula. Reverend Joseph C. Verhelle, S.J. is new Principal at St. Ignatius High School, Cleveland. Reverend Thomas G. Williams, S.J. is new Principal at Seattle Preparatory. Reverend Robert J. Lab, S.J. is new Principal at University of Detroit High.

TWO NEW HIGH SCHOOLS OPEN: St. John's High School, 5901 Airport Highway, P. O. Box 7066, Toledo, Ohio, 43615. Opened up with Freshman Classes this year. Reverend Robert J. McAuley, S.J. formerly of the University of Detroit High School is the new Principal. Walsh Jesuit High School, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio 44224 also opened this year with Freshman classes. Reverend Thomas J. Bain, S.J. formerly of St. Ignatius, Cleveland is the new Principal.

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY is beginning academic programs leading to doctorates in education. The university will offer both the Ph.D. degree and the Ed.D. degree. Major fields in the new doctorate program will be in administration, counselling psychology, curriculum, and foundations of education.

XAVIER UNIVERSITY is well along with the building of its new library. The three story building will have a capacity of more than 400,000 volumes and will increase the Xavier library facilities by at least five fold. The building is being constructed on the modular plan which will allow for future construction and additions with the minimum cost.

BOSTON COLLEGE has established a Russian and Eastern Europe Research Center. The Center will have offerings for both undergraduate and graduate students. It will prepare students for work in the State Department, foreign trade, the intelligence agencies, and college teaching.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY has announced their very ambitious plans for the rebuilding and renovation of the University Medical Center. The initial outlay calls for the sum of \$16,500,000. Preliminary plans call for a multi-purpose building to house the Medical Center library and Administrative offices; an addition for research to the Medical School building; expansion of research and clinical facilities; a new 500 bed addition to Firmin Desloge hospital; an addition of two floors to the Wohl Mental Health institute; a multi-storied parking garage.

Work is steadily progressing on the two new buildings **REGIS COLLEGE** presently has under construction. Each of the two buildings, a 150,000 volume library and a science building will be three stories high. Financing will be under the Higher Education Facilities Act with matching funds from Regis. It is hoped the buildings will be ready for the fall of 1966.

STRAKE JESUIT PREP is the new official name of the former Jesuit College Prep of Houston. Strake is now making final plans for the new air-conditioned faculty residence. Mr. Strake is the benefactor who gave so generously to the foundation of the Houston school. Another benefactor, a non-Catholic, has given the school the Shadybrook Farm estate. The home and accompanying grounds, located on Galveston Bay, is valued at \$300,000. The Scheer family of Houston were the benefactors.

LOYOLA of NEW ORLEANS is building their first dormitory for co-eds. The 14 story building will cost \$2,400,000 and will accommodate 420 women students. The co-eds have been housed previously in converted residences near the campus. September of 1966 is the deadline for the opening. The New Orleans school also announced that they plan to move the Loyola Dental School to a new site opposite the Charity Hospital on Tulane Avenue. The new site was purchased for \$970,000. The proposed \$7 million dollar, nine story building will provide space for 320 dental students, 100 dental hygiene students and some 15 or 20 graduate students. The new building will also enable the Dental School greatly to enlarge their clinical facilities.

The **U.S.S. O'CALLAHAN** is the first Navy ship to be christened by a nun and is named for the only Naval Chaplain to win the

Congressional Medal of Honor. The ship, a 3,800 ton destroyer, is named after Father Joseph T. O'Callahan, S.J. who received the nation's highest award for his heroism in World War II when he was stationed on the aircraft carrier U.S.S. Franklin. Father O'Callahan's sister, a Maryknoll nun stationed in the Philippines christened the new ship.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY recently held its ground-breaking ceremonies for the \$15 million complex at the Fordham University Lincoln Center Campus. Lincoln Center has the cultural advantage of the proximity of the complex of city and state and private institutions such as the Philharmonic Hall, the Metropolitan Opera, The New York State Theatre, the City Center of Performing Arts. An idea of the size and influence of the neighboring Performing Arts Center will be realized when we see the proposed price tag of some \$75 million for construction. Fordham's School of Law is already in operation at the Center.

Both **FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY AND FAIRFIELD PREP** will benefit from the estate of a retired school teacher, Miss Mary F. Luby. Both schools will receive a \$50,000 gift from Miss Luby's estate. The University will use its funds to establish a Chair of Education; the Prep will use its share as a scholarship fund for gifted and needy students. Miss Luby's gift was occasioned by her deep respect for the Jesuit ideal of teaching in the classical tradition.

